THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXIV JUNE, 1937 No. 204

EDITORIAL

Now that the Coronation is over, we can sum up some of its lessons. The soundness of the instinct which almost everywhere had eagerly looked forward to it was proved abundantly. Just here and there a definitely hostile voice had been heard. It was "a worked-up ballyhoo," "a second-hand artificial circus," "a dull procession of old men," "a clumsy recruiting ramp." These phrases are from an article in the May number of a highbrow monthly paper, the work of an embittered intellectual, which has no relation to the feelings of the real plain man John Citizen. Those cannot be discerned in a study. They come through human contacts. Samuel Barnett, remorseless critic as he was of West End selfishness wherever it masqueraded in the guise of charity, was captivated by the 1887 Jubilee.

> "Day after day," he wrote, "we have been gazing and gadding; gazing at decorations, processions; gadding among the crowds of sightseers from eight in the morning till two the next morning. Gradually our carping, criticizing radicalism has faded, we feel that only a monarchy can express national feeling, that expenditure on show is profitable, that the past is more than the present, that unity is stronger than individualism, and that 'God save the Queen' is as true as it is beautiful. There! Really the week has been an education. It has shewn the value of a big idea and the need of a big expression to convey the idea. People have lived down to the mean idea of profit and loss and have been mean; they can live up to the big idea of a nation and be good-tempered and generous. Then big shows are wanted to express the big idea."

This was generous, because 1887 was a period when there really was a good deal of rather flamboyant Imperialism, and it is difficult to suppose that the celebration of the Queen's

Jubilee was not untainted with it. But even so, the human element was stronger than pride of wealth or predominance of red on the map. It was the little old lady in the black bonnet, it was the bereaved, never-forgetting widow, it was the mother of a people that the crowds cheered, and it was the man who knew and loved East London who understood it.

Today it is easier to maintain a balance, even while rejoicing. Life has become more arduous. The old security has gone, and with it has gone the old complacence. We are tiptoe, and we must either run or fall. Two years ago King George V.'s Silver Jubilee struck a more solemn note than had been heard before. There was abundance of gaiety. We all changed hats and danced as much as ever. But there was very little vulgar pride about it. And there was much more than mere good-fellowship. There was a moving of the conscience, a sense of desire to work for a better world. There was a sense of vocation, a remembrance of the unseen, of the Kingdom of God. The way in which the observance of the Jubilee was everywhere touched with piety was very notable. This time even more. The occasion is splendid. The uniforms are gorgeous. It would be easy to be " drunk with pride," if that were all. But the Anointing and Crowning of a King according to the English Use is so plainly a religious rite that no one can fail to see that it is an Act of Church and State, of Church much more than State. The King is anointed, crowned, and blessed by the High Priest. He then puts off his Crown to receive the Holy Sacrament. There, at the heart of an event which poor Mr. Gigadibs calls a dull procession of old men and a clumsy recruiting ramp, is the " Do this " which comes to us out of the simplicity of the Upper Room, which was released by the Tragedy of Calvary, and owes its power to an unseen Event which is believed to have occurred in a suburban Garden. It was finally broadcast and democratized at a Harvest Festival. There is nothing here which need seem remote from the poor man or from the circle of ideas in which he lives. And it was brought to the hearing of millions by the B.B.C. To the virile solemnity of Mr. Iremonger's handling of his difficult task the cause of the Recall to Religion owes a great debt.

The Rite in the Abbey was a focus which gathered and concentrated vast masses of goodwill and semi-piety. Again and again it has been manifest during the last thirty years that both *eudokia* and *eusebia* are in abundant circulation.

From time to time, as on Armistice Day, they come to the surface and eddy about, seeking a channel of expression. They achieve only very transient expression. "Lest we forget," or even "God rest their souls," are true and good sentiments, but they soon pass. Their force is dissipated, and does not "condense to purpose strong." At the same time, if it is announced that there will be a Requiem at the Parish Church, or if in the interests of the Recall to Religion the parishioners are bidden to Holy Communion, it does not even occur to John Citizen that it is meant for him. He has not yet seen the connection between the daily bread and the Holy Bread. We have not yet discovered the technique of which Father Hebert writes in *Liturgy and Society*, by which the garage-boy, being prepared for Confirmation, will be taught that his work and his religion are all part of the same thing. Could not some wise and experienced parish priest take up Father Hebert's hint and tell us how it can be done?

In the meantime the Abbey Rite does help enormously to bridge the gap. For here are all the generous emotions of a simple and good-hearted people, quickened and intensified by a great occasion, rising in national loyalty and personal affection to greet a man who has been called unexpectedly to a position, unsought by himself, of immense and terrifying responsibilities. Here, on the one hand, is the general but unformulated goodwill. Here, on the other hand, is the representative of that form of government called democratic, which still believes that it has a key to the promised land of ordered liberty. Not even the most barren imagination can fail to see that the King must be thinking, and wondering, about the future. Granted that there is a divine vocation for the British nations and for the world, how is it to be made actual? Is it to be drawn down from heaven, or is it to be elicited from the things of earth? Does not the vision of King and Queen, having put off their newly-gained Crowns, kneeling before an altar, while an Archbishop serves them with that which was given for them, that which shall preserve them, body and soul, unto eternity, provide the answer? The *viaticum* furnished for the pilgrimage of life as King and Queen, and for the life beyond that, is on its earthly side "the best and purest wheat bread that may conveniently be gotten." On its Godward side it reproduces the miracle of divine condescension that was wrought when the Word became Flesh. Does it not bridge a gap? Is not the Archbishop in the Abbey, is not every servant of the altar, a *Pontifex*?

What can we do? Many, both priests and faithful laymen, get depressed at times, because they see no way in which the Gospel can be brought to bear. A thoroughly good, but not very vigorous, country priest once said at the end of a very hot Sunday afternoon, "I couldn't make anything of the children today. I tried them with Daniel, I tried them with Jonah, I tried them with all the things that I thought would be most interesting, but I couldn't make them listen." Even those who have some gifts of teaching and leadership, and use them, are more often in this case than they probably recognize, and not with the young only. We need to work out a better technique. And that involves thinking, hard thinking, just as laborious as that of a Chancellor of the Exchequer looking for new ways of sharing out the burden, or a captain of industry looking for new markets. There are superficial devices, like making collections of newspaper-cuttings and working them into sermons, consulting the index of *Thirty Thousand Gems of Thought* for appropriate quotations. These are not evil, but they only scratch the surface. Something is wanted that goes deeper than that.

Mr. Christopher Dawson, speaking of the Celtic monks who did so much for the conversion of Europe, says:

> "Far more than the preaching of bishop or priest from the distant city, the presence of these colonies of black-robed ascetics must have impressed the peasant mind with a sense of a new power that was stronger than the nature spirits of the old peasant religion. Moreover, the Irish monks were themselves countrymen with a deep feeling for nature and the wild things. . . . These were the men to whom the conversion of the peasants was really due, for they stood so near to the peasant culture that they were able to infuse it with the spirit of the new religion. It was through them that the cultus which had been paid to the spirits of nature was transferred to the Saints."

Then he quotes from the Liturgy for the Advent Ember Days: "The earth has yielded its corn, wine and oil, and now the ineffable Birth approaches of Him who through His mercy bestows the Bread of Life upon the sons of God."

Mr. Dawson is not unaware of perils in this:

> "It is true," he says, "that the cult of the local sanctuaries and their pilgrimages gave occasion to all kinds of strange survivals. But it was this very continuity of cultus—this association of the old with the new—which opened the peasant mind to Christian influences that it could not receive in any other way."

And then he significantly adds: "The disappearance of the old peasant customs in later times has often been accompanied by a relapse into paganism of a far deeper kind than the paganism of archæological survivals." For holy wells and relics and pilgrimages read petrol-pumps and athletic records and dog-tracks. We have not thought deeply enough what the work done by Columbia, Columbanus, Aidan and Cuthbert would mean in our day. It would not mean a return to mediævalism, it would not mean a cutting loose from Christianity. It would involve touching the life of modern man with a Christian touch at some deep and vital point. What point is there? What points are there? And how are they to be touched?

ADMISSION TO HOLY COMMUNION

In an article published in Theology, June, 1936, I attempted to shew that to admit to Communion persons who persisted in a course of conduct condemned by the Church is not necessarily to approve or condone that conduct. And I quoted some passages from St. Cæsarius and St. Augustine to illustrate my point. Dr. N. P. Williams, in the *Church Times** of March 5, 1937, has maintained that those passages have a quite different meaning. According to him, "what these passages really mean is only that the Bishop, if he thinks it expedient, can refrain from imposing on 'notorious sinners' the additional humiliation of excommunication by name, it being assumed that they are in any case excommunicate *ipso facto*. The last thing in the world of which either Augustine or Cæsarius would have dreamed would have been the assertion that such persons can be or continue to be communicants, still persevering in their sin."

I do not quite understand what is meant by persons being "excommunicate *ipso facto*," when a formal sentence of excommunication has not been pronounced against them: unless it is that, being in a state of grave sin, they are deemed by authority to be unworthy to communicate, and to do so at the peril of their souls. But that is just the point I was arguing. St. Cæsarius and St. Augustine, though convinced that certain persons were in grave sin and consequently incapable, in their view, of worthy participation in the Eucharist, nevertheless did not actually repel them. So far from never "dreaming that such persons can be or continue to be communicants, still persevering in their sin," they were gravely distressed because for one reason or another they felt themselves forced to tolerate just that very thing.

Dr. Williams is quite right in asserting that the exact meaning of excommunicate is "to excommunicate nominatim," "to issue a formal sentence of excommunication against a particular person or group of persons." As such it is a very serious step to take, a weapon only to be used as a last resource. But this does not affect the historical argument that in the fifth century it was not uncommon for a Bishop to refrain from thus formally repelling an unrepentant sinner from Communion.

* I am sorry that the editor of the *Church Times* found himself unable to print the reply to Dr. Williams which I asked to be allowed to send him. There would have been an obvious convenience in the reply reaching the same readers as the criticism.

And if he did not thus formally repel him, then when such a sinner presented himself for Communion, the Bishop gave him Communion, and allowed him to communicate.

Dr. Williams' argument rests on the assumption—for which he produces no evidence—that the sinners against whom these Bishops refused to pass a formal sentence of excommunication were voluntarily abstaining from Communion; and we are meant to suppose that if any one of them tried to communicate, the Bishops would very quickly have done something about it. By not excommunicating the sinner they were only "leaving him alone in his present state of voluntarily incurred, or automatic, exclusion from the Holy Feast." I think that this gives a very wrong idea of the conditions of the time. For the truth is that most of these people continued to be regular communicants, and sometimes, because of that, a sentence of excommunication was passed, and sometimes it was not.

It may be worth while to examine the passages again from this point of view. In Augustine's Serm. 351, paragraph 7, we are told that many scelerati do in fact communicate; and in paragraph 10 that a Bishop can only "prohibit from Communion" where he has documentary proof of guilt. There is nothing in that to surprise anyone. And in Serm. 352 he warns adulterous husbands not to attempt to communicate, if the Bishop knows of their adultery, lest they be thrown out of the Sanctuary (ne de cancellis projiciantur). All this is exactly what Dr. Williams would expect St. Augustine to do. But it makes all the more striking the evidence for an opposite practice contained in the passages I have quoted.

In Serm. 82/11 he complains that people often criticize him for taking no action with regard to certain sinners. He says that that is not true. Wives sometimes come and tell him of their husbands' adultery, and he interviews the husband and tries to drive home to him the gravity of his sin. This is not an easy task, for they often reply, "God is indifferent to sins of the flesh" (Peccata carnis Deus non curat). Now sometimes, no doubt, Augustine was successful in persuading the man to give up his sin and do penance. But sometimes, clearly, he was not. And then it seems probable that the man went on communicating as before. For (1) he was not convinced that he had done anything very wrong—peccata carnis Deus non curat—so why, in his view, should he not communicate? And (2) if he did stop communicating, the congregation had very little ground for complaint that the Bishop was not doing anything. And if that is the case, then Augustine is giving Communion regularly to one whom he knows to be a persistent and unrepentant adulterer.

In Serm. 17 we are told that drunkenness is so prevalent that no one takes any notice of it. (Abundat tale peccatum et contemnitur: quis non contemnit ebriositatis peccatum ?) If the sin was so common, and if no one thought anything of it, is it likely that all these many drunkards were voluntarily abstaining from Communion ? But Augustine himself thought it a very serious sin. It is one of those of which St. Paul says that " they who do such things shall not inherit the Kingdom of God " (Gal. v. 21). And Augustine says that such persons are spiritually dead (tales jam in anima mortui sunt). Yet he will not force them to abstain from Communion; and this, not because he does not know who they are, but because he is afraid that such a step may only make things worse for the sinner (ne ipso flagello peior fiat qui cæditur).

In *Encheiridion* 80 we are told that some sins are so customary " that not only do we not dare to excommunicate a layman for them, we dare not even degrade a cleric." I do not know why Dr. Williams thinks that in this passage St. Augustine is only lamenting the laxity of the Bishops, including presumably himself. It seems to me quite clear that he is lamenting the evil times which make such lax discipline necessary. But the passage is a very striking one, because of the phrase " nec clericum degradare." For if the clergyman was not degraded, he continued in his ministry. So here we have clergy whom St. Augustine knows to be sinning gravely still allowed to celebrate the Holy Mysteries. The Anglican Bishops have not yet proposed that. Or, if these persons were, in fact, only minor clergy—but I do not know why we should suppose that to be the case—they were still allowed to assist at the Sacred Mysteries and to hold office in the Church. And if the clergy, in this passage, have not ceased to perform their office, why should we suppose that the laity have ceased to communicate ?

In the passages, Augustine, *Contra Epistolam Parminiani* III., 13-14, and Cæsarius, Serm. in *M.L.* 67, col. 1085, and Serm. 288 and 289 in *M.L.* 39, the reason given for the refusal to excommunicate is the number of the sinners of a particular class, and a public opinion which does not take a very serious view of their sin. There is no reason here, either, to suppose that such sinners, though not formally excommunicated, had in fact ceased to make their Communions. On the contrary, the very fact of their numbers, and that they were not conscious of grave sin, makes such an assumption most improbable.

Moreover, if they had ceased to communicate, and if any attempt on their part to resume Communion would have been promptly met by a formal sentence of excommunication, why

should Cæsarius speak so regretfully of his inability to excommunicate? And why should the Donatists have thundered so loudly against the laxity of Augustine, or why did not Augustine silence their objections by a simple statement of the facts?

But it may be thought that all this is only to reply to Dr. Williams' "unthinkable" and "unbelievable" with similar assertions of probability and merely personal conviction. But fortunately in the *Contra Epistolam Parminiani* Augustine makes it quite clear that the persons who are not the object of a formal sentence of excommunication do continue to communicate, and that, not only in the Catholic Church, but in the Donatist Church also. Augustine is replying to the well-known Donatist argument that the unworthiness of the minister affects the validity of sacraments, and he asks his opponents about the notorious unworthiness of some of their own ministers whom nevertheless they had refused to excommunicate. Are not, then, their own sacraments vitiated?

In Book III. he deals at length with the scriptural text advanced by the Donatists to support their rigorist discipline—1 Cor. v. 13: "Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person." In cap. 7 of this book Augustine asks why they do not also quote the immediately preceding passage, 1 Cor. v. 11: "If any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, with such an one no, not to eat." And he supposes that it must be because to do so would expose them to the retort, "Have you, then, no knowledge of any covetous man, or railer, or drunkard, or extortioner among yourselves? Why, then, do you not only take food with such, *but even allow them to communicate*?" (sed etiam cœnam mensæ Dominicæ communicatis?).

In cap. 8 he goes on to say that if the Donatists dare to deny that there are any such persons in their Communion, and should even attempt to defend Optatus, who was notorious throughout all Africa (qui universæ Africæ notissimus fuit), and whom they endured for so long, what about St. Cyprian? In the *De Lapsis* St. Cyprian complains that so many of the clergy are usurers and extortioners; but he and his colleagues did not excommunicate them; on the contrary, they *continued to allow them to communicate* (cum his avaris et rapacibus . . . panem Domini manducabant et calicem biberant). So that the Donatist rigorous interpretation of the Pauline text must be wrong. And if it be replied, he says, that usury is not such a very serious sin, that is not the view of St. Paul or of Scripture generally. And the gravity of a sin is not to be judged by the general opinion, but by the written word of God. And so Cyprian thought also. And then, in answer to the objection,

" but how, then, are we to interpret this text ?" he gives the short essay in pastoralia which I originally quoted: " Excommunication depends on the number of sinners involved and the state of public opinion: where it is impossible, we must be content, like Cyprian, with rebukes and exhortations, and the threat of divine wrath."

No one, I think, will now deny that the passage taken in its whole context shews quite clearly that the persons whom Augustine refused formally to excommunicate " could be and continue to be communicants, still persevering in their sin." And the reason given, in this case, is that it is better to tolerate these grave sinners rather than by excommunicating them to run the risk of schism. And there is Dominical authority for this in the parable of the wheat and the tares.

In view of all this, then, is it to " ascribe to the saint an unbelievable complaisance towards dishonesty " to suppose that in Ep. 153 Augustine continued to give Communion to a thief who refused to restore stolen property, since he says that he is only prepared to excommunicate si res magis curanda non impedit ? And, besides, we find the same kind of reasoning in Pomerius.

In the *De Vita Contemplativa*, Lib. II. 4 (*M.L.* 59), Pomerius replies to the question, " Why do not the Bishops reprove or correct the ' penitents ' who have given up none of their former practices, and who have changed only their habit and not their habits ?" (conversi qui ex pristinis moribus nihil abjiciunt, non mente mutati sed veste, nec actu sed habitu). Now the conversi, being a particular kind of penitent who were to all intents and purposes monks, were almost certainly regular communicants. What does Pomerius answer ? That the objector is relying on mere gossip, that the sins are not grave, or not notorious, or cannot be proved ? Not at all. He says that with some people harsh measures only do harm, but gentle tolerance may convert. If weak persons, who cannot bear severe treatment, are excommunicated they either fall into despair and avoid the company of good people by whom they might be restored to God, or they become headstrong and reckless in sinning. With such people it is better to go gently, and by quiet reproofs gradually to wean them from their sin, and inspire in them a love of virtue. Then in cap. 7, turning to the treatment of sinners in general, he admits that there is a limit to this tolerance, and that persistent obstinacy must be ended by excommunication. But we may legitimately wonder, in view of the criticism implied in cap. 4, how often that limit was reached.

Nevertheless, the question of when to repel from Communion

and when not was, and is, a great pastoral problem. St. Augustine deals with it again explicitly in the *De Fid. et Op.* Dr. Williams asserts, quite wrongly, that this work tells against my thesis. The position is this. St. Augustine is asked to permit the baptism of persons who, being re-married divorcees, refuse to give up their "adulterous" unions. He refuses. He is met with the objection that this is Donatist rigorism, and in conflict with the Dominical instruction not to root out the tares from the wheat. He makes a twofold reply: (1) That the discipline for those who seek admittance to the Church is not necessarily the same as that for those already in the Church. And (2) that the toleration of wicked persons within the Church does not involve the complete abandonment of all ecclesiastical discipline. This second reply I dealt with in my original article, and it need not be restated here. Though I may add that the persons whom it was desired to baptize were certainly expected to become communicants; and therefore those wicked persons, whose tolerated presence in the Church seemed to give some justification for this baptism, must have been communicants also. Otherwise the argument must have run: "Let us baptize these people, although, of course, they won't be able to communicate." But there is no suggestion of that (see cap. 9).

With regard to the first reply, in cap. 31, St. Augustine says that to refuse baptism to unrepentant sinners is not to root out the tares, but to refuse to sow them: it is not to exclude guests from the wedding-feast, but rather, by their unrepentance, these persons shew themselves not to desire to be guests. But with those who renounce their sins in word but not in deed, and are baptized, then, since they are already within the Church, whether known or unknown, there will be a reason for tolerating them if there is no means of correcting them (sive lateant, sive *pareant*, tunc erit ratio tolerandi, si potestas nulla est corrigendi). And, again, in cap. 32 he says that if a man promises to give up his sins, but does not, and afterwards cannot be corrected, some way must be found of preventing his corrupting others, so that although he exists in the Church as a bad man, yet he should not establish there his bad doctrine. But to baptize unrepentant adulterers would be to establish the doctrine that adultery was an unimportant sin. Here St. Augustine lays down the distinction between doctrine and discipline which the Anglican Bishops have so clearly drawn. He does not speak of excommunicating the adulterer, necessarily, but he does state firmly that his doctrine must be denounced.

But it is certainly true that St. Augustine does not like this toleration. He would formally excommunicate, if he could, without damage to the unity of the Church. And he is insistent

that where the Bishop does not excommunicate he must be zealous in rebuke and exhortation. Nevertheless, the fact remains that he did tolerate grave sinners remaining communicants, and hotly denied that this involved any condonation of their sin.

As a matter of historical fact, therefore, I am unrepentant in maintaining that it was not uncommon for a Bishop to go on administering Communion, for pastoral reasons, to persons whom he knew to be living unrepentantly in grave sin. And this in spite of the scandal and the charges of laxity which were in fact made, and which could have been at once stifled by a formal pronouncement of excommunication. Dr. Williams suggests that even so this "represents only one stream of tradition." Still a tradition from Cyprian to Augustine, from Augustine to Cæsarius, and from Cæsarius to Pomerius would deserve some consideration even if it stopped there, and there is no reason to suppose that it did.* And if it be argued that it is not a Catholic tradition, the case rests in far abler hands than mine. For in all his many works against Donatism, Augustine is at pains to shew that his system of discipline is Catholic, and that the Donatist severity is not.

And so I repeat that the proposal not to repel from the Eucharist all unrepentant sinners, without further question, is an example of a pastoral care and prudence which is in accordance with Catholic tradition. What is novel is the proposed application by the Anglican Bishops of this particular discipline to this particular matter. So far as I know the Church has always passed a sentence of formal excommunication upon unrepentant remarried divorcees who seek to remain communicants. But this novel application is not a question of logic or principle, but of politics and pastoralia. And I dare say that in the administration of discipline the Bishops are the best judges. At any rate it is, primarily, their responsibility.

But, as the examples from these early days of the Church shew plainly, it must always be made abundantly clear that the Church does not approve of these second "marriages," and that she regards those who contract them as being in grave error; their continued membership of the Church is only tolerated in the hope, as Pomerius puts it, that the society of good people, from which otherwise they might cut themselves off, may convert them and restore to them a knowledge of God's will.

ROBERT MORTIMER.

* See, for example, the replies of Alexander III. and Innocent III. about tolerating the continuance of certain marriages wrongly contracted (Comp. I. c. 3, *Qui clerici vel voventes*, iv. 6, and Comp. III. c. 2, *Qui matrimonium accusare ponent*, iv. 13. Quoted Brys, *De Dispensatione in line Canonica*, p. 153).

THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT

THE newly awakened interest in the construction and meaning of the services of the Church, which is known on the Continent as the "Liturgical Movement," and which from its nature and the fact that it pays a certain compliment to the methods of worship of the Church of England should be of interest to us, has so far attracted little attention in this country.

On all hands we hear of a falling off in church attendance, of a lessening attachment to "institutional religion," of refusal on the part of people any longer to accept Christian dogma. Emphasis is laid upon an assumed antithesis between the teaching of Christ and the doctrine of the Church. It is not that our Lord has lost any of His attractiveness, but that the visible Church, through a combination of conservatism and *laisser-faire*, has failed to interpret the spirit of His teaching to the present age. New learning of all sorts, and that not limited to a small class of intellectuals, new powers of observation and new faculties for introspection have, so it is said, alienated an up-to-date mankind from a faith which satisfied men who were without these advantages. Either they will do without religion altogether, or will "work out their own salvation" in their own way, without the help of ecclesiastical organizations. If the Church is to retain or regain the allegiance of the nation, its doctrines must be "re-stated" in terms of modern knowledge. The whole make-up of Christianity needs to be recast in modern mould, when—and here admiration for its Founder, which men find so difficult to shake off, makes its influence felt—the Church will be found still to have a message for the world.

Such are the sentiments which in recent years have formed the undertone of all discussion of religious subjects. No doubt there is a certain amount of truth in what is said. But it is paying rather a high compliment even to our newly educated proletariat to credit the ordinary man with having thought out the motives for his actions to this extent. Other explanations may be given for the break away from religious observance. The last twenty years has been a period of shock and unrest. As an offset to the mental acumen of the post-war generation there has been a good deal of intellectual weariness, and a good deal of following the line of least resistance. Quite commonplace things, like the week-end habit, have had something to do with the falling off in attendance at church. People who might have "turned up" if they had been at home have not troubled to find their way to a strange church when they were staying in a friend's house, or, being in holiday mood, have

taken a rest from their ordinary habits. Cheap cars and motor-bicycles have played havoc with country congregations. The parson has not had things all his own way on Sunday. The cinema proprietor and purveyors of all sorts of outdoor amusements have had something to say. It does not do to overlook the fact that the Church's hold over people was never so strong as it appeared to be. Many of them went to church because there was nothing else to do. The devout, and people with strong convictions or a strong sense of duty, were not affected by counter-attractions. But facilities for amusement and week-end visits have accounted for a great many.

Still, neither these things nor a deliberate intellectual weighing up of the pros and cons of religious observance provide a wholly satisfactory explanation. There is a reason for the falling away which lies much deeper. Churchgoing was a habit. There are some habits which have their roots deep in the sub-consciousness of their devotees, and these are not easily eradicated. There are others which have no solid foundation of this sort, and they do not endure when the habit has ceased to be the fashion. When religious practice ceased to be followed as a matter of course, as it certainly has during the last generation; when people began to question tentatively the usefulness or the obligation; then, any defect which there might be in the Church's system of worship would make itself felt without their quite knowing why. They would conclude that Church services do not appeal to them, and they would stay away. It is only the very few who attempt any explanation beyond that. The statements usually made by people when challenged are significant: "I don't go to church, but it isn't that I don't believe in God. I don't feel that going to church does me any good. I can live as good a life without it." The former of these statements is an assertion of the distinction between public worship and theological opinion. The second is an assertion of the distinction between public worship and personal piety. Ordinary people can lay their fingers on a symptom, but they have to go to an expert to determine the cause of it. The trouble here is not that people have no faith or no religion, but that the church services do not appeal to them. They do not find in practice that they touch either religious instinct or belief. In the great majority of cases an intimate conversation will reveal in the man who never goes to church some substratum both of faith and religion. Here, then, we get on the track of the difficulty. The problem of church attendance is not a religious or theological but a liturgical one. If we wish to solve it we must concentrate, not on the creeds or on the practice of personal religion, but on the liturgy.

This threefold division of the Church's activities which is here hinted at may not be generally familiar. The Christian religion is a theological system. In distinction from all other religions it is founded upon truth. The importance of the articles of the creeds is that they are for the most part historical events, which took place at a definite time. But the vast majority of Christians are only touched very lightly by this system. A great deal of it they are incapable of understanding. They accept the Incarnation and Atonement as historical facts. It is necessary that they should be brought into touch with the system, but not that they should make a detailed study of it. Their standpoint may be that of St. Anselm, *Credo ut intelligam*, or of Tertullian, *Credo quia impossibile*. The main thing is that it should be there as the background of their life. "The Catholic Faith is this, that we *worship* One God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity."

Christianity is also a system of holiness. Its aim is the perfection of every soul. Prayer, the steps which lead the soul to eventual union with its Creator, has been worked out in detail by a succession of masters, who have learned much from pre-Christian sources, for the mystical element in religion is as old as the human race. The needs of every soul are not alike, and where this element enters into public worship it undergoes considerable modification. For then the needs of the whole body of worshippers are considered, and the public service of the Church is no more the occasion for the practice of mysticism than it is for the study of theology.

Christianity is also a system of worship. It is this with which we are chiefly concerned, and which we shall now go on to consider in detail. The other elements are not absent from it, but it may be said at the outset that where the liturgical worship of the Church fails of its purpose, it is mainly because one or both of the other elements in Christianity have been allowed to take possession and upset the balance.

The primitive worship of the Church was social in character. It was the meeting together of a family, the functioning of the mystical Body of Christ. The Christian liturgy was built up on the lines of a mystery-cult. There is no occasion for panic here. Not so long ago there was a considerable fluttering of orthodox dovecots when attention was drawn to this in somewhat unusual phraseology. The trouble was that the statement was made by one who is thoroughly distrusted as a theologian, and it was met with emphatic repudiation. Christianity regards God as the Creator and Ruler of the universe, who "at sundry times and in divers manners" has revealed Himself to men. The religions which preceded the full revelation of God in the

Incarnation of the Eternal Word are looked upon as attempts to "feel after Him and find Him," and there is no need for dismay if the full revelation exhibits some affinity with the imperfect forms of worship which it came to fulfil. "Mystery in its general sacral meaning is the representation of the salvation-myth on which is based the existence of the cult-community which meets for the celebration of the mysteries. Similarly, the Christian Mystery is the representation of the saving work of Christ, on which the existence of His Church is based" (Dr. Herwegen, *Kirche und Seele*, p. 15, quoted by Fr. Hebert in *Liturgy and Society*, p. 64).

In the celebration of the Christian Mysteries ("these Holy Mysteries"; both the Roman Missal and the Book of Common Prayer thus describe the liturgy) there is set forth the foundation truth of Christianity, the "redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ." It is in consequence of this, and in order that this redemption may be made effectual for every soul, that the Christian brotherhood came into existence. No brotherhood can be maintained in being by an abstract idea. The Christian society endures by virtue of the fact that continually by the offering of these "Holy Mysteries" its members "shew the Lord's death till He come." Moreover, this "continual remembrance" communicates the merits of the redemptive work of our Lord to every member of His Mystical Body. Here the social aspect of the Catholic religion links up with the mystical.

So there is a unity in the worship of the Church. The Sacrifice of Calvary, which is an eternal fact, "a Lamb, slain from the foundation of the world," was manifested in the order of time and space. This Sacrifice is now represented sacramentally. Every Eucharist is the Sacrifice of Calvary, presented now in its aspect as an eternal reality—*sub specie eternitatis*—and it is as if the Church in every place "tunes in" to this reality. The Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ in Heaven is thus made available for every altar in the world, without any loss to Him or any movement on His part. The Church is not a mere collection of separate congregations. The congregation in every town and village is the Church Catholic in that place.

This is illustrated in the form of the service. We are fortunate in possessing in the Apology of St. Justin Martyr a very early account of the Sunday morning worship of the Church. The date of this is between the years 140 and 155. It is an accepted principle of interpretation of such documents that when we find a practice established we can date the beginning of it back at least fifty years. What St. Justin describes had not come into existence in a moment. So his

account takes us back to the lifetime of St. John, and so links us up with the Church of the apostolic age. It is also significant that in its main lines the liturgy has remained unchanged ever since. As we shall see later on, what is wrong with our worship now is not the liturgy, but the improper use of it, or the neglect of it by the substitution of other services of a different character.

Now we may glance at some extracts from St. Justin's account, which are quoted here not quite in the order in which he gives them, but in the order in which the service actually took place.

"On the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the Apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits. Then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things; then we all rise together and pray. . . . Having ended the prayers we salute one another with a kiss. There is then brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of wine-and-water; and he, taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of the universe, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and gives thanks at considerable length for being counted worthy of these things from him. And when he has concluded the prayers and thanksgivings, all the people present express their assent by saying 'Amen.' . . . And those who are called by us deacons give to each of those present to partake of the *eucharistized* bread and wine-and-water, and to those who are absent they carry away a portion."

Here we unmistakably have, as in our own service, the Epistle and Gospel, the sermon, the Offertory, the prayers said in unison by the people, that is, the *Sanctus* and *Gloria in Excelsis*, the Canon, and the Communion. The salutation in the Church of England at present only survives in the salutation of the people by the priest which is incorporated in the blessing.

The general plan of the liturgy has endured to the present day. But the liturgy includes more than the plan of the service. The people must be *en rapport* with the spirit of it. If what may be called the liturgical sense be lost, however perfect the actual rite may be, it is likely to fail of its purpose.

The course of events between the Edicts of Toleration and the beginning of the Middle Ages did tend to obscure the primitive idea of worship. The Church came face to face with the problem of evil on a large scale. She survived the first test of intellectual infidelity, and then had to meet and overcome the menace of moral and spiritual evil. How appalling that could be is well described by Mr. Chesterton in his *Life of St. Francis*. A foulness spread over Europe which defiled life at every point. It was borne in upon the conscience of Christians that the main purpose of life in these circumstances was the salvation of each man's soul. The life of personal

holiness became of greater importance than the communal life in the family of God. The Church did nothing by halves. Just as she had Christianized the pre-Christian forms of worship, so now she set herself to Christianize non-Christian mysticism. With the Neo-platonists as a practical starting-point, she indicated out of her own ever-increasing experience the successive steps by which the soul of men can ascend to union with God. The monastic ideal and the Rule of St. Benedict were her answer to the latest attack of the devil. But the life of prayer was not confined to the monasteries, and growth in personal holiness was the aim of all sincere Christians.

There is nothing here to criticize. What we now call the Evangelical side of religion must always hold a prominent place in the consciousness of the Church. It is emphatically the business of the Church to save men's souls. But in time of stress it is always hard to preserve one's balance, and what happened here, and what often happens now, is that people got obsessed with what they supposed were the needs of their own souls, and—here is the important point—approached the corporate worship of the Church with that as the principal object in view.

The result was that the Mass became a sacerdotal function which concerned the hierarchy rather than the people, and as far as they were concerned it was an opportunity for the practice of devotion. They occupied themselves during its course according to their spiritual standing, with prayer or contemplation, or with saying the Rosary. This devotional habit has endured to the present day in the Roman Church, and in spite of the efforts made at the Reformation something like it persists amongst ourselves. It is a matter of great difficulty to persuade a congregation to do more than listen to a service, or at the best to join in the recitation of parts of it in an undertone, though they will sometimes join vociferously in non-liturgical hymns. The extent to which the liturgical sense has been lost is shown by the perfectly genuine belief that a broadcast service serves the same purpose as worship in church. You have a sermon and beautiful singing, and from the depths of your comfortable armchair you hear the prayers most artistically recited, and what more can you want?

Though matters had not come to this pass, the problem before the Church at the close of the Middle Ages was to recover the lost ideal of worship.

The Reformation claimed to be a return to primitive ideals in doctrine and worship, after the abuses of the Middle Ages had been swept away. The Reformation was not all straightforward going. A tremendous upheaval of that kind, which, it

must be remembered, extended a long way beyond the boundary of religion, is always an opportunity for fanatics to encourage the bees in their bonnets to fertilize and swarm. A good deal of energy had to be expended by the more knowledgeable leaders to prevent the wrong things being done, and in this way they did not always succeed. But as far as methods of worship were concerned, the Church of England was on the right lines. The effective force was Cranmer, and here Cranmer was at his best. He was far more of a liturgical expert than he was a theologian or a leader of men. His work was a triumphant success. It is all the more remarkable when it is remembered how English people always resist change, to the point of declining even to consider whether or no the change may be for the better. A liturgy in their own language was forced upon them, sometimes at the point of the sword. The extent to which Cranmer understood what the worship of the Church ought to be is shown by the space taken up in the Prayer-Book in explanations of what is being done, and why. The people were intended to follow and take part in the service. They learned their lesson. Today there is a definite liturgical tradition amongst us, and the Liturgy is regarded with the same, or even with a greater, reverence as the Bible.

The Church of England has passed through many vicissitudes since then, the general effect of which has been to obscure the liturgical sense by directing it into wrong channels, but the right tradition is there, and can be built upon.

The effect of the counter-Reformation, on the other hand, was to stereotype the popular practices of the Middle Ages. In the parts of the Church which were influenced by it, religious practice since the sixteenth century has been marked by the subordination of the liturgy to the supposed needs of the individual, and the Mass has become an opportunity for each member of the congregation to engage in devotions of his own against an atmospheric background provided by the ceremonies and music of the Mass, and, most of all, by the fact that Mass is being said. Communion, on the whole, has been neglected, and extra-liturgical devotions, such as Rosary, visits to the Blessed Sacrament, and Benediction, all of which provide means for personal approach to God, have become the most popular observances of the Church.

This is the condition of things which has led to the Liturgical Movement. The purpose of the revival is to restore to public worship its primitive liturgical character.

Any local church which undertakes this has to reckon with the manner in which the liturgy has developed. To an unprejudiced observer it must be evident that the use of a language

other than that commonly spoken by the people must make a complication. It is not entirely that it is a tongue "not understanded" of the people. It is easy even for uneducated people to acquire a sufficient knowledge of Latin to enable them, with the assistance of the ceremonies, to follow a service in its main lines. It is that the language of the liturgy is not that which they use with the greatest ease, and in which they think. It may not have been realized yet by those who are guiding the movement in the Roman Church that the logical outcome of it is the use of a vernacular liturgy. Some of the defences of an universal language for the liturgy are a little thin. It is said that it emphasizes the unity of the Church, and that the faithful, wherever they may happen to be, find the same familiar service in every church. But the number of the faithful who drop in casually to hear Mass in different parts of the world is very small, and there is surely something to be said for considering the enormous majority who stay at home. The retention of Latin for the convenience of the travelling public is not really a strong argument in its favour. It is true that Latin is a better language for singing in than English, but that again is a minor point. A more formidable one is that a satisfactory rendering into English of the Roman Liturgy has never been achieved; but that can be pressed too far, for although in its sequence of thought and its prayerfulness the Roman Mass is almost above criticism, its verbal expression, even in Latin, in places leaves a good deal to be desired.

In this respect the Church of England has a great advantage. Not only has she a vernacular liturgy, but her people love it, and the ideal for most of them is to follow the words of it as they are recited. It is true that the supposed necessity for simplification was carried to an extreme, and that the present arrangement of the component parts of the service is thoroughly bad, but there is something here to build upon, and if a true liturgical sense can be fostered the way might be opened for a revision which would be more successful than the last ill-fated attempt.

The great difficulty is that the laity of the Church of England have become accustomed to attend the choir offices and treat them as their chief religious observance, and these offices do not reflect the primitive liturgical ideal. It is easy to find fault with Roman Catholic practice, with neglect of Holy Communion (although a great improvement has taken place in this respect), and with the inordinate popularity of evening Eucharistic devotion, but the average Anglican not only neglects Holy Communion, but neither hears Mass nor attends such services as Benediction or Devotions.

The choir offices of the Prayer-Book are based upon the Breviary, and they suppose a regular attendance or at least regular private use on weekdays as well as Sundays. They are ordered normally to be said publicly in church. The Psalter is recited monthly, the New Testament is read through twice yearly, and a considerable portion of the Old Testament once yearly. So used they provide a regular course of prayer and instruction. It was never intended that one of these fourteen weekly services should be isolated from the rest, and exalted into the main spiritual pabulum of the people. Sunday Morning Prayer is in its right place as an introduction to the Sunday Eucharist, and it is the Eucharist which is the great weekly act of worship of the Christian family, as it was in the earliest ages of the Church, and as it continued to be until the eighteenth century. During that unspiritual period the old ideal was lost sight of and in its place a new conception of religion arose. Morning Prayer, transferred to a later hour, became for all loyal men the weekly opportunity for a formal recognition of State religion. The observance was no longer associated with the representation of the Sacrifice of Calvary by the Mystical Body of Christ, but with such ideas as " setting an example," conventional respectability, and good form. The proper order of the services was retained, and Holy Communion in consequence was administered, when it was administered at all, at midday. But it was regarded as an observance for the gentry only, and it was not until the Church revival of the nineteenth century that early celebrations were instrumental in getting rid of class distinctions in connexion with it. But the early celebration also had the effect of isolating Morning Prayer, and the adoption of the cathedral type of musical service in many parish churches, extending eventually to quite small country churches, made Morning Prayer in practice, and in the estimation of most of the people, the chief religious observance of the Church of England. The departure from the liturgical ideal of the primitive Church has then been as complete in the Church of England as in the Church of Rome, though it has come about in a different way, and a way that will probably make recovery more difficult.

Whatever liturgical value the choir offices possess, and in their proper place and used in the right way it is considerable, has been obscured by the popular method of " rendering " them. " Anglican " chants to the Psalms, with their commonplace and catchy tunes, and the practice of making the words fit the tunes rather than the tunes the words, have detracted from the meaning of the words, and very often rendered them unintelligible altogether. Canticles have been " set " to

elaborate music more suited to the concert hall than the church. Creed, Lord's Prayer and responses have been intoned on so high a note that it is difficult for the congregation to take part, and the last abomination, now happily fast dying out, has been a harmonized setting of the General Confession. A modified form of choral penitence is still in use in some churches. Add to this the custom of singing three or four hymns, and these of a type more suited to private devotion than public worship, and for the most part set to feeble and "jammy" tunes, and we have a general effect which reduces religious observance to a mixture of æstheticism and sentimentality.

It is not surprising that in a critical age, and one in which the younger people take nothing for granted, church attendance has fallen off. The practical question which arises is whether, and in what way, the Liturgical Movement can be turned to account in the English Church. The movement has begun by learning from us, for, put in the simplest way, one of its leading principles is that if people go to church they ought to take some interest and some definite share in what is taking place. It is for us to see what we in turn can learn from the application of this principle to the worship of the Roman Catholic Church.

The first thing to be done is to establish the Eucharist in the position it held in the primitive Church, as *the* service of the Church. And of the Eucharistic service the receiving of Communion must be the climax. It is not sufficient to persuade people to hear Mass; the ideal is that the whole Christian family should partake of the Sacrifice. That must take time, and, until it can be achieved, at least no insuperable obstacle must be placed in the way of Communion. That means that the Sunday worship of the future must be at a considerably earlier hour than 11 o'clock. Without going into the question of the fast before Communion, it must be remembered that the practice of fasting reception is widespread in the Church of England as elsewhere, and that the practice is catholic in the best sense. There is no legal obligation, although for Roman Catholics it is now the subject of a rule. But in earlier legal codes, although it is always assumed, it is regarded as so fundamental as not to need to be legislated for. It would be quite useless to try to remodel the worship of the Church of England on the basis of the fast before Communion being unnecessary, or a pious peculiarity of a few enthusiasts. And to pass from the sublime to the less sublime, the middle morning service is gradually losing the position it once held. The gentry no longer attend it as a matter of course. Sunday is no longer a day on which, even if you were not in church, it was wicked to be doing anything else. There is some hope of marshalling the Christian

community for worship at the beginning of the day, but none at all of appropriating a slice out of the middle of the day and dislocating plans for the weekly holiday. We have not only to provide for the few whose main interest in life is devotion, but for the many whose interests are varied and absorbing in their degree. It is one thing to ask them to foregather with their brethren at the altar of God at the beginning of the day, and quite another to expect them to stand by until a late hour of the morning to take part in a service which from its character might just as well be postponed altogether until the evening. In fact, it is the absence of any special character in the " morning service " which has led to neglect of morning worship by so many in favour of the evening service, which they feel does just as well.

The next step, in some places at any rate, will very likely be the rigorous simplification of ceremonial. It is strange that men who depend so much on ceremonial in their social life and are familiar with it and partial to it in the Army and Navy, in the Law Courts, in Parliament, and in civic functions, should be so distrustful of it in connexion with religion. Religious ceremonial should never be mere pageantry, and should never be tolerated for mere show. It should be understood, and understood to the point of the congregation being able not only to watch it, but to take part in it. For this to happen, it must be of a simple character. The general fault of the worship of the English Church is that there is nothing much for the people to *do*. The Romans are nearly as bad, except on certain days, such as Candlemass, Ash Wednesday, Palm Sunday, Good Friday, which have appropriate ceremonies in which the laity have a definite part. The point is of importance. Englishmen are usually excused for their dislike of " fuss " on the ground that they are self-conscious and undemonstrative. But they are not self-conscious and undemonstrative in their own homes. The reason they are so in church is because they do not regard the church as their home, and they do not look upon the rest of the congregation as members of their own family. It is just this feeling that should be fostered. It is useless to tell people that their worship is the gathering of a family before its Father: until they can be made to feel at home they never will believe that they are.

There are two features of eucharistic worship which come within the sphere of action to which liturgical reformers might direct their attention. One is the Offertory. (Is it really necessary to explain that by the Offertory is not meant the collection ?) At Christ Church, Oxford, it is the practice for certain of those who are present at the Eucharist to make their

contribution to the collection in a particularly formal manner. Each in turn advances to the altar, on which is placed an alms dish, to place his money in this, and then kneel for a few moments in prayer. Some of the liturgical reformers on the Continent have adopted a similar plan for the more important part of the Offertory. One of the ministers holds a ciborium, and by his side stands a server with a vessel containing altar breads. All who intend to receive Holy Communion come forward in turn and, taking a wafer from the vessel, place it in the ciborium. It is a reconstruction of the primitive practice of the communicants themselves bringing the bread and the wine to be consecrated. "The underlying symbolism is that at the Holy Sacrifice the lives of Christians themselves are offered up to God, to be a living sacrifice in union with the Head."*

Secondly, there is the salutation with a kiss, mentioned by Justin. Kissing is not, in the West, the normal mode of brotherly greeting between men. The Roman ceremonial has retained the custom, and modified it. The modification is edifying enough to those who are accustomed to it and understand it, and, moreover, it is limited to those who are sitting in choir. It would not be very easy to imagine it extended to a whole congregation. But a salutation as part of the Sunday morning service, an outward act by which the whole of those present, and not the ministers only, acknowledged one another as brethren and as children of one Father, would be a particularly edifying piece of ceremonial. We are accustomed to the handshake both in ordinary social usage and also as a bond of union between members of certain brotherhoods and guilds. It would not be difficult to modify the "pax" so that the message of peace was conveyed from the priest through his assistants to the whole congregation.

Everybody knows how the value of words is enhanced if action is combined with them. Worship which provided for active participation by all present could not fail to have a deeper significance than the extreme sacerdotalism which permits a congregation to "assist" by the fact of their presence and their intention. Extremes meet here. To isolate oneself physically from the rest of the congregation in a pew that resembles a sitting-room is indicative of the same attitude of mind as to isolate oneself mentally by engaging in spiritual exercises of one's own choice until recalled by a bell to a momentary attention to what is taking place at the altar.

Other details must come in for attention in turn. Community singing has caught on, and can be turned to account

* Hebert, *Liturgy and Society*, p. 129.

in worship. What can be done in the way of congregational singing has been proved by the annual *semaine liturgique* in Belgium, and by the annual sung Eucharist of the Mothers' Union at Southwark Cathedral. The English Church needs to be rescued from music of the "sloppy" and sentimental type. The traditional music of the Church is free from reproach, but it is commonly said that the people dislike plainsong music. The truth is that modern organists, except the best of them, dislike it, and neither they nor the clergy understand it well enough to be able to teach it. It has stood the test of many centuries of use, and the people will like it and sing it well, if only sufficient trouble is taken to teach them.

Perhaps most important of all, the social life of the family of God needs to be carried into the everyday life of the people. Or conversely, the social links which bind the people need to be strengthened by the gathering of those who are already neighbours and friends round the altar of God. The worship in church will "go" better if the participants already know one another well, and the casual stranger who finds his way to church on Sundays will at once be affected by the atmosphere of unselfconsciousness which he finds there. A member of a Congregational chapel recently remarked to the present writer: "Most of the chapels round here are not doing very well now, except ours; but we are doing well because we are all friends and are constantly meeting one another during the week."

In the Roman Church the Liturgical Movement, though it is making good progress, has not yet attained to very great dimensions. When it does, there is always the danger of a movement of this sort failing to commend itself to the Church authorities. The Curia is stupidly conservative on occasion, and a move towards a vernacular liturgy, for example, might lead to the whole movement being severely frowned upon.

The peculiar genius of the authorities of the English Church is for taking the less important features of a movement such as this and blessing them, and at the same time hampering the progress of the movement by condemning the only things about it that really matter. We started from the admitted failure of institutional religion to maintain its hold. Obviously something ought to be done. If it is to be accomplished it will be carried out, in the first place, as nearly all reforms are, by the clergy. But it will have to be done by degrees, and with the good will of all concerned.

H. Chalmer Bell.

THOUGHTS ON THE "RECALL TO RELIGION"

An interesting picture of English religion in the Victorian age has recently been given by Mr. R. C. K. Ensor. "No one," he writes, "will ever understand Victorian England who does not appreciate that among highly civilized, as opposed to more primitive, countries it was one of the most religious that the world has known. Moreover, its particular type of Christianity laid a peculiarly direct emphasis upon conduct; for though it recognized both grace and faith as essentials to salvation, it was in practice very largely a doctrine of salvation by works." He points out that even writers whose views were far removed from Protestant orthodoxy were affected by its ethical spirit. "T. H. Huxley, the agnostic, oozed evangelicalism from every pore of his controversial writing, and Cardinal Newman composed in the *Dream of Gerontius* a poem of pure Catholic orthodoxy to which nevertheless no Irish or Continental Catholic could have given its peculiar flavour at the time, nor anyone probably who had not breathed from early life the air of evangelical England." Among the features of Victorian religion he mentions its belief that the present life is important only as a preparation for eternity. "Exalted minds in abnormal moments may have reached that feeling in all ages. But the remarkable feature of evangelicalism was that it came so largely to dispense with the abnormal, made otherworldliness an everyday conviction, and so to say a business proposition; and thus induced a highly civilized people to put pleasure in the background, and what it conceived to be duty in the foreground to a quite exceptional degree." "This religion," he continues, "is often now accused of being gloomy. Certainly it was antihedonistic. Today's passion for pleasure would have shocked it profoundly. Its own corresponding passion was for self-improvement; and perhaps there has never been an age and a country in which so many individuals climbed to outstanding excellences or achievements of one sort or another across the most discouraging barriers."

Those whose memories go back to the nineteenth century will probably agree that this picture is a just one. The type of character which was fostered by Victorian religion was sturdy and self-reliant. It has become fashionable to describe the Victorians as hypocrites, but Mr. Ensor is certainly justified in saying that "the religion-ruled Englishmen then dominant in the governing, directing, professional and business classes spent far less of their time and thought on sex interests than either

their Continental contemporaries or their twentieth-century successors; and to this saving their extraordinary surplus of energy in other spheres must reasonably be in part ascribed." The age had, of course, the defects of its qualities. "Victorian public opinion," it has been said, "taught Englishmen to push. Today we are being taught to lean," and there can be little doubt that the pushing man, whose force of character is often combined with less admirable qualities, was unduly admired. But the reign of Queen Victoria was not an inhuman and brutal age. During it the social conscience became increasingly sensitive to the claims of the poor and weak, and the humanitarianism of the twentieth century has its roots in the past.

When the time comes for the historian to treat of the age in which we are living now, he will draw a very different picture of its religious life. He will find, I think, that while the Church of England still commands the support of many devoted adherents and has never performed its pastoral functions more conscientiously and efficiently, its hold even on its nominal members is weaker than it was, and that the same is true of Nonconformity. There is still in this country little open hostility to the Christian religion, but the mass of the people have lost the firm convictions which inspired and invigorated their grandparents, and have adopted an attitude to religion which can best be described as sentimental. They are proud of our ancient churches and cathedrals, but seldom enter them for purposes of worship. They are on the whole glad that there is a State Church, and that representatives of religion play a prominent part on certain ceremonial occasions. They still, as a rule, ask for the services of the clergy at weddings and funerals, and usually bring their children to be baptized. The demand for the disestablishment of the Church of England forms no part of the programme of any political party, and is most often voiced by members of the Church itself. The attitude of the average Englishman to religion is still tolerant and friendly, but it is an uncomfortable thought that this tolerance and friendliness is more marked among older people who were born in homes where religion was actively practised than among the younger generation. The Church must look forward with some trepidation to the situation which will arise in the future, when it must look for support to men and women whose early days were not spent in a religious atmosphere.

To what causes should this serious change of attitude be ascribed? There can, of course, be no doubt that the evangelicalism of the nineteenth century received a severe blow from the

popularization of the Darwinian theory and from the rise of the science of Biblical Criticism, which called in question the belief in the infallibility of the Bible. But I do not think that these causes have much to do with the neglect of religion at the present time, which in his broadcast address the Archbishop attributed in part to " the new scientific outlook on the universe and on man's life within it which seems to see no place for a personal God or for the inherent worth of the human soul." This point can, however, easily be exaggerated. Hostility to religion and unwillingness to accept its claims are no commoner in scientific circles than elsewhere; the Church has made concessions to the scientists, and they for their part are much less inclined to claim that they have solved the problems of the universe than were their predecessors in the nineteenth century. It would be foolish to assert that the speculations of the few men of science who care to discourse on the ultimate nature of reality are likely to bring many into the fold of the Church, but it is at any rate satisfactory that the rigidly mechanical theory of life which certainly left no place for freewill has been abandoned by all scientists whose opinions matter, though it may linger among psychologists.

The influences which threaten religion at the present time arise to a far greater extent from politics than from science or philosophy. It is almost impossible to exaggerate the effect which has been exerted on the minds of many of the younger generation by the anti-religious policy of Soviet Russia. Many generous but uncritical young people, not all of whom would call themselves Communists, have come to think that in all countries religion is on the side of what they call reaction. Overlooking all the savagery with which the Russian Government has pursued and continues to pursue its objects, they persist in regarding Russia as the only European state where the Government aims at the elevation of the downtrodden and oppressed. The fact that the Soviet Government has not been content to remedy the undoubted abuses of the Russian Church, but has raised atheism to the level of a dogma, has had the most devastating repercussions. Socialism as we have hitherto known it in England has been, on the whole, free from anti-religious bias. Its earliest apostles were orthodox Nonconformists, who might well have become lay preachers if they had not preferred to devote their oratorical gifts to the service of the working-class movement. But things are changing now. There is a very serious danger that the supporters of Socialism, at least among those who are rather absurdly called " intellectuals," may adopt as part of their creed a doctrinaire anti-clericalism which has hitherto been almost unknown in English political

life. These young people do not trouble to study the record of the Church in the matter of education and of the relief of distress. They are so much impressed by the existence of economic inequalities and injustices that they regard as reactionary an institution which throughout its history has based its teaching on the principle that "man doth not live by bread alone" and has ranked spiritual higher than material values. Those who feel like this are attracted by the so-called philosophy of Communism, which seeks to find a materialistic or economic explanation for all the facts of human history, and regards as a heresy the view that the human spirit with divine aid is capable of mastering its environment. It is pathetic that at a time when all serious thinkers are discontented with nineteenth-century determinism a theory of life is being preached as a gospel which rests on such discredited assumptions.

During the recent constitutional crisis it became very clear that many Socialists resented the part played by the Church in bringing matters to a head. Their point of view is strongly put in a letter which appeared in the *New Statesman*: "No doubt, according to their principles, the Churchmen had to fight the proposed marriage of the King. Certainly they have won, and those who regard clericalism as a menace to civil liberties should take warning from their present state of glee. The power of the Church of England was dwindling; that institution has some genuine Radical and Pacifist elements and some suave Liberal voices. But, on the whole, in town and village, it speaks for reaction. Impotent to create, it is still strong enough to interfere, destroy, and repress. Since it is an appendage of a capitalist State, it dare not interfere with the major evils, war, poverty, and so forth. What it can do and does is to interfere with and oppose campaigns for rational, decent, and humane measures like Divorce Law reforms and provision of Birth Control instruction. We may be sure that clericalism will now fight harder than ever to hold all its forts of intolerance and obscurantism. The recent victory of clericalism, celebrated with such whoops of joy by the Church, is full of menace for all who believe in liberty of mind and conduct."

It is quite obvious that the writer of this diatribe welcomed the opportunity which had presented itself of expressing his dislike of the influence of the Church of England on our national life, and that this dislike arises from the fact that the Church does not identify itself with the political views which he happens to hold, and tends to take a rigid line on certain ethical questions. It has been a real disappointment to many in this country that

on these questions the practice of Soviet Russia seems recently to have become less "enlightened," and that that country shews signs of becoming less hostile to the practice of religion. Russia may perhaps become a Christian country again. But the harm has been done, and, as we see in Spain, hostility to the Church has become part of the creed of revolutionary parties. It has indeed long been so on the Continent, but this attitude is becoming not uncommon even in England, and it is as well that the Church should be aware of the fact.

If the account which has been given of the state of religion in this country is anywhere near the truth we are not justified in feeling complaisant, even if we number among our acquaintance many enlightened practising Christians, and even if the clergy of the Church of England have never been more earnest and hardworking and her theologians more distinguished than they are at the present time. There can unfortunately be little doubt that in every class of society those to whom the Church means much are in a small minority, that the attitude of most Englishmen to religion is at best one of kindly and sentimental tolerance, and that a section of the population tends to regard the Church with hostility, not so much because it considers Christian doctrine to be untrue as because it holds organized religion to be a bulwark of a social and economic system of which it disapproves. Even those who do not actually denounce the Church as a pillar of "Capitalism" refuse it their allegiance on the ground that it concerns itself with the salvation of the individual soul, and does not use its machinery for the furtherance of the social and political reforms which they happen to favour. This being so, it is not surprising that the Archbishop's "Recall to Religion" has been welcomed by all who have the interests of religion at heart both within and without the Church of England.

In his broadcast address the Archbishop summoned us "to refound our life, personal and national, on the fear of God, and on the standards of human conduct which Jesus Christ has set," and referred to the "slackening, sometimes even the scorning, of the old standards of Christian morality, the loosening of the ties of marriage or of restraint upon the impulses of sex." I confess that these words recalled to my mind some stanzas of Horace:

> Fecunda culpæ sæcula nuptias
> Primum inquinavere et genus et domos;
> Hoc fonte derivata clades
> In patriam populumque fluxit.
> Motus doceri gaudet Ionicos
> Matura virgo et fingitur artibus
> Iam nunc et incestos amores
> De tenero meditatur ungui.

The ode in which these lines occur begins with an appeal to rebuild the temples of the gods and to revive the practice of the old Roman religion.

> Delicta maiorum immeritus lues
> Romane, donec templa refeceris.

The circumstances in which Horace wrote these words can still provide us with suggestions and with warnings.

When, after the defeat of Antony and Cleopatra, Augustus became practically the absolute ruler of the Roman world, he decided to adopt the rôle of a restorer of the best Roman and Italian traditions. His success at Actium had put an end to a long period of civil war, which latterly had seemed to be developing into a war between East and West. Antony, through his association with Cleopatra, had appeared to identify himself with a Greco-Oriental civilization which was regarded by Italians as decadent and effeminate. It would be a mistake to regard the language used by the Augustan poets of Antony's "Ægyptia coniux" as insincere. There was a genuine feeling that the "barking Anubis" whom Propertius contrasts with the Roman Jupiter represented a set of influences hostile to the manly qualities which had made Rome great. Since the Roman citizenship had been extended to the Alps by Julius Cæsar a feeling of Italian nationalism had arisen, taking its colour from the traditions of Rome, and finding its best expression in the poems of Virgil, who was born in a city which had not long been fully incorporated in the Roman state.

Long before the age of Augustus Polybius had attributed the honesty shewn by the Romans in their public life to their fear of the gods. The inevitable result, he says, of casting doubt on the existence of gods and on a system of rewards and punishments is a decline in morality. Nothing except a fear of divine punishment can keep the ordinary man from breaking the moral law. This view was undoubtedly shared by the most thoughtful of Roman public men. Cicero, whose theological beliefs were of the vaguest, regarded the neglect of the practice of religion as a disquieting feature of his time. Auspices were disregarded, temples allowed to fall into disrepair, and important priesthoods left vacant. All this was associated by him with a decline in public and private virtue, and had he lived to see the principate of Augustus we may be sure that he would have given his warmest support to the Emperor's Recall to Religion.

Augustus was particularly alarmed by the "loosening of the ties of marriage and of restraint upon the impulses of sex." He feared that the family life on which the old Roman culture

had been based was on the decline, and that Romans were shrinking from the responsibilities of parenthood. Rather unwisely he decided to pass legislation penalizing the unmarried and imposing heavy penalties on those guilty of adultery. The passing of these laws was celebrated by the revival of the Secular Games, a religious festival which he hoped would usher in a new era of virtue and fruitfulness. In the mind of Augustus, sexual irregularities were closely associated with a decline in manly virtue.

> Nescit equo rudis
> Hærere ingenuus puer
> Venarique timet, ludere doctior
> Seu Græco iubeas trocho,
> Seu malis vetita legious alea.

He evidently thought that that revival of the old Roman cults and the punctual observance of the *ius divinum*, together with a certain amount of legislation, would instil into the governing class a desire to emulate the virtues of its ancestors and render it more fit to perform its task of ruling the world.

The virtues which the Romans ranked highest are those which are characteristic of the best type of Englishman. They were level-headed and sensible, ready to compromise, and prepared to leave other people alone. "Instinctively," says Professor Santayana, "the Englishman is no missionary, no conqueror. He is rather glad and relieved if only natives will remain natives and strangers strangers, and at a comfortable distance from himself. His adventures are all external; they change him so little that he is not afraid of them." But these admirable qualities which have so well qualified Englishmen and Romans to rule subject peoples are associated with corresponding defects, and in no respect are these defects so obvious as in the sphere of religion. "Roman religion," says Professor Nock, "is in its essence a matter of cult acts. What results has little to do with emotion or imagination or speculation of the individual. Roman religion is made up of traditional practice and animated by patriotic spirit; it was not a matter of belief."

It was in accordance with this spirit that Augustus "surrounded his throne with a religious nimbus." Probably no theological ideas entered his head. He knew that in the past Roman institutions had been associated with the practice of religion, and was unwilling in this, as in other respects, to break with the past. Wishing to give stability to the new form of government which he was creating, he sought to confer on it a religious sanction and to bring about an alliance of throne and altar.

There is perhaps just a little danger that the recent "Recall to Religion" in this country may be interpreted in too Roman a spirit. The appeal was made at a time when the constitutional crisis was in the minds of all, and is associated with the coronation of a King and Queen who embody the domestic virtues. This being so, it is impossible that the Archbishop may be regarded as an advocate merely of a return to Victorian respectability rather than of something far finer and more fundamental. "Traditional practice" and "patriotic spirit" are good things, but they do not form the essence of the Christian religion. English religion has often tended to be a little provincial and too closely associated with the typical English virtues. The Church of England is rightly proud of having taken the *via media* at the time of the Reformation, but the price which she has had to pay has been a certain isolation from the main currents of Christian thought and practice. This point is well illustrated by a paragraph which occurs in Sheila Kaye-Smith's novel, *The End of the House of Alard*:

"Then may I ask in what way the religion of Vinehall is so superior to the religion of Leasan?"

"Just because it isn't the religion of Vinehall—it's the religion of the whole world. It's a religion for the whole world, and not just for Englishmen. When I was at school I thought religion was simply a kind of gentlemanly aid to a decent life. After a time you find that that sort of life can be lived just as easily without religion—that good form and good manners and good nature will pull the thing through without any help from prayers and sermons. But when I saw Catholic Christianity I saw that it pointed to a life which simply couldn't be lived without its help—that it wasn't just an aid to good behaviour, but something which demanded your whole life, not only in the teeth of what one calls evil, but in the teeth of that very decency and good form and good nature which are the religion of most Englishmen."

The warning conveyed by this passage is a very timely one. The weakness of Victorian evangelicalism was that in some ways it was very insular, and tended merely to give a consecration to the type of character and conduct which was admired in this country at the time. It laid great stress on certain virtues and paid little attention to others. Mr. Laurence Housman has said that it was characterized by "a smug adaptation of Christianity to social conventions and worldly ends." It is certainly true to say that, if it had shewn the same hostility to Pride and Avarice as to the sins of the flesh, its influence would have been greater in the world as a whole, and perhaps in England itself. There are seven Deadly Sins

and ten Commandments, and there is a little danger that if the Archbishop's appeal, like that of Augustus, lays exaggerated stress on breaches of the Seventh Commandment, it may in some quarters be misinterpreted.

The Anglo-Catholic movement in the Church of England is considered by Mr. Ensor to be one of the causes of the decline of the typically Victorian conception of religion. He sees in it a desire on the part of the Anglican clergy to retain "the vantage-ground which they enjoyed over their rival practitioners," the Nonconformist ministers, from whom all the ancient disabilities were being gradually removed. This is, of course, ludicrously untrue of all worthy adherents of the movement, but I think that Mr. Ensor is right in regarding Anglo-Catholicism as a solvent of evangelicalism. The Tractarian leaders, who possessed the historical sense in a much higher degree than their opponents, were aware that the religion of the time was tinged with provincialism and with the cult of respectability. Their insistence on the divine origin of the Church and on the continuity of the Catholic tradition was a protest against the idea that the Church of England was merely a national institution, tied to a conception of life which happened to appeal to their contemporary fellow-countrymen.

In almost all the comments on the Archbishop's appeal which have appeared in the press, or been heard on the wireless, there has been some reference to what are called the "rival religions" of Communism and Fascism. This analogy is surely a little misleading. There can indeed be no doubt that in Russia, Germany, and Italy the political ideals of the dominant party are systematically instilled into the young, and are accepted by a large part of the population with a fervour which is often called "religious." But this means simply that these essentially political movements have succeeded in filling many of their adherents with a fanatical enthusiasm which recalls the spirit which has sometimes animated religious individuals and peoples in the past. A movement cannot properly be described as religious merely because it inspires fervour in its supporters. "It is our task," said a recent speaker on the wireless, "to shew that in our religion can be found a way of life for the modern world as practical as those offered by the new faiths, and far nobler and permanently satisfying." Is there not a danger that this sort of language should suggest a wish to apply the name "religious" to a set of political and social ideals which happen to suit this country and some others, but which do not make the same appeal elsewhere? It would be unfortunate if the fanatical nationalism of certain countries should have the effect of driving us to invest with a religious

halo our own political ideas. To do Stalin and Hitler justice, they shew a fairly clear appreciation of the essential character of Christianity; hence their hostility to the Church. We do not talk so much of "the unchangeable and eternal principles of the moral law" when political questions are being discussed, as was done in the days of John Bright. We are less cocksure than we were of the superiority of British institutions to all others. But we are still apt to expose ourselves to the charge of self-righteousness, and it would be a great pity if this tendency were to be fostered by religion. Whatever may be said in favour of a national recognition of religion, the Church must always be on its guard against making an idol of the institutions and ethical standards of the State to which it belongs. Such an attitude is essentially pagan, and it was against such an attitude that the early Church protested. Conscious as the early Christians must have been of the admirable features of Roman rule, they preferred to die rather than use language suggesting that the State was more than a creation of human wisdom.

We are sometimes told that the Archbishop's appeal will fail unless it preaches a religion which has "the revolutionary note of early Christianity." What exactly does this mean? There can be no doubt that the early Church brought into the Roman world a conception of religion which contrasted sharply with the set of ideas inspiring such movements as the Recall to Religion made by the Emperor Augustus. Pliny the Younger, a fairly typical Roman official, described the Christian way of life as a *superstitio prava immodica*, by which he meant that to the Christians religion did more than give a consecration to the performance of the ordinary duties of a good citizen. Christianity inspired in its adherents an attitude of the individual soul to God which was unfamiliar to the ordinary virtuous Roman, and which he was apt to consider dangerous. Of course, the Christians were not the first people in the ancient world to protest against the coldness and formality of the official State cults. The struggle between the Roman government and the Church is prefigured in the *Bacchæ* of Euripides, and the popularity of mystery cults in the Roman Empire shews a discontent with the narrowly ethical character of the State religion. The attitude of the Government to the Church recalls that of headmasters who are strong supporters of compulsory chapel while they discourage Communicants' Guilds and similar societies as inconsistent with "good form."

When, therefore, we speak of the early Church as "revolutionary," we mean little more than that it put religion higher than patriotism. There is no reason to think that it felt any-

thing but respect for the system of government which did so much to facilitate the propagation of the new faith. When St. Paul says that "the powers that be are ordained of God," he is not merely expressing a personal opinion. The Christians of the early centuries were not hostile to the political and economic system under which they lived, but they felt that on occasion it might be their duty to put the claims of God, of the individual conscience, higher than their duty to the Roman authorities, and this exposed them to the charge of *odium humani generis*.

Most of those who nowadays use the expression "the revolutionary note of early Christianity" mean something very different. They wish the Church to identify itself with political and social movements aiming at the overthrow of what is vaguely called "the capitalist system," or at least at fundamental social changes. During the General Strike of 1926 efforts were made to win the support of the Church for the strikers on the ground that it was the duty of organized religion to oppose economic injustices, and today enthusiasts are urging her to adopt an extreme attitude on the equally difficult problem of the "Means Test." It is hardly necessary to refer to the attempts which are being made to force the Church to take a definite line on the thorny question of War and Peace. Important as these questions are, it would surely be a disaster if the Church were to be identified in the public mind with a partisan view of problems which are admittedly complicated, and on the solution of which very varied opinions are held by men of equally good will. A man may "give all his goods to feed the poor" or support a political movement which makes such action compulsory without possessing the essential Christian grace of charity. Christian charity may lead individuals to feel it their duty to support political movements which may fairly be described as revolutionary, but the same charity should enable these individuals to tolerate fellow-Christians who do not share their views.

Critics of the Church too often forget how great have been her services to social reform throughout her history. But such activities have always been secondary, and the extension of the functions of government in modern times has made it less necessary than it once was for the Church to concern herself, for instance, with education and poor relief. Though no good Christian can be blind to the claims which his fellow-men make upon him, religion is not to be identified with humanitarianism. As was said by Principal Caird, "A humane and charitable life, gentle and kindly words and deeds, may be the expression merely of a kind of spontaneous or instinctive sweetness of

nature, a soft, susceptible, sympathetic temperament which, however attractive and amiable, has as little affinity to religious notions and beliefs as the fragrance of the flower or the song of the summer bird. Religion may deepen and hallow such instincts, it cannot create them." Religion rests on a philosophy of life, the universal acceptance of which would certainly do much to further social reform, but the Church would be untrue to her best traditions if she surrendered to what may be called a camouflaged materialism. The view that character is determined solely by environment should be regarded as a heresy, and the words of St. Paul should not be forgotten: "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me."

If a revival of religion is not to be identified with what is called a "reawakening of the social consciousness," what steps ought to be taken to remedy a situation which is admittedly unsatisfactory? No good results will follow from watering down the Christian faith and from minimizing the claims which it makes on the individual. To do the younger generation justice, it is serious-minded and has a great distrust of mere sentimentality. It is quite capable of listening to and understanding expositions of Christian doctrine. The so-called "rival philosophies" have pretty clear-cut doctrines which are attractively expounded. "If," said the Archbishop of York recently, "the ordinary members of the Christian Church become inarticulate whenever searching questions are raised in their presence, the suggestion is inevitably strong that there is no very plausible case to be made for the Christian interpretation of life." The Church is well supplied with men who are qualified to help such people, and it is to be hoped that they will not shrink from undertaking evangelistic work, even if they have expressed themselves adequately in print. For some strange reason young people are more inclined to read books dealing with religion if they are written by scientists and journalists than if they are the work of men who have given their lives to the study of theology.

But this country will never be won to Christianity by thoughtful addresses to educated men and women. Much more is wanted than that. A generation is growing up which has never breathed a Christian atmosphere, and the members of which have not even the sentimental associations with religion which prevent their parents from being openly hostile to the faith. It is therefore more then ever necessary to strengthen the position of religion in the schools and to secure that at an impressionable age it is made attractive to children. The teaching of religion presents some of the same problems as are presented by the teaching of music and art. Some people

possess the *anima naturaliter Christiana*, just as some are naturally musical or artistic. But the idea that music and art should play no part in the education of those who are not highly gifted has long been abandoned, and even children who will never be capable of good original work are taught to appreciate pictures and music. As Plato said, educators should surround the young with beautiful sights and sounds. Those who associate their education with Beethoven and Mozart will, one hopes, always feel their superiority to jazz. In the same way, those who in their early days have become familiar with the noble ideas and the noble language of the Bible and the Prayer-Book will have in their minds a standard by which they can judge the documents of any new "religion" which may try to win their support.

Much, too, can be done by making Church life more friendly, and by associating with its definitely religious activities organizations which may attract those whose attachment to religion is not yet very close. Lay members of Parochial Councils might well assist the clergy in the work of visitation, as is done by "Elders" in Scotland. Many who are not positively hostile to religion might become churchgoers if the claims of religion were put to them by laymen whom they liked. Such suggestions could be multiplied. Everything possible should be done to dissociate the practice of churchgoing from smugness and middle-class "respectability."

There is no short-cut to a revival of religion, and consciously "revivalist" movements seldom produce lasting effects. No desire for converts should tempt the Church to make concessions inconsistent with historical Christianity. After all, the Church has weathered a good many storms in the course of her history, and we should be lacking in faith if we did not believe that she stands for truths the value of which is unaffected by modern scientific discoveries and modern political theories. Christianity is concerned with the problem of the significance of human life, and this problem is no less mysterious to us than it was to the Christians of the Roman Empire, of the Middle Ages, and of the seventeenth century. The Church in which men of all these periods found peace of heart has a message for the present time, and it is the duty of Christians of today to convey this message to their generation.

G. H. Stevenson.

CHURCH AND STATE IN ANCIENT INDIA

THE first business of a Christian in a controversy is to grasp his opponent's point of view: but to do this efficiently he must stand back from the immediate problem, in which his bias would disturb his judgment. This means an appeal to History. In the case of the issues of Church and State the appeal had better not be to Christian history, for our bias would not then really be put aside. Rather, let Comparative Religion come to the rescue. The rule in India of the Emperor Asoka and his "Establishment" of Buddhism will afford us the view of a great statesman with strong religious convictions at work upon the religion of his subjects under conditions which do not compel us to take sides.

The fourth and third centuries B.C. were days of dictators and totalitarian states. The empire of Alexander the Great had for a parallel in India the rise of the Mauryan Empire under Chandragupta and his successors. Asoka was Chandragupta's grandson, and when he came to the throne as a young man about 272 B.C., he found himself ruler of almost all India. During his reign of forty years he published under the name of Priyadasi many Edicts to be observed by his subjects, and he caused them to be inscribed on rocks and pillars in suitable places throughout the dominions. Many of these inscriptions, which are among the earliest reliable evidence for Indian history, remain to-day almost as clear to the eye as they were when they were first cut, and they offer the reader a fairly comprehensive view of the history of the reign and of the mind of the Emperor. Especially do these Edicts help us to understand his dealings with the Buddhists, for they are concerned with religion more than with any other subject.

At the beginning of his reign Asoka was not a Buddhist; nor was he deeply interested in religion. But some nine years after his accession he led his armies in a war against the Kalinga tribes, and the cruelties and wholesale bloodshed of the campaign bred in him a strong disgust against warfare. On his return to his capital of Pataliputra, the modern Patna, he fell in with Buddhist teachers, whose disgusted detachment from life matched his newly-born pacifism, and in 261 B.C. he became a Buddhist layman. In Edict XIII. on True Conquest he says: "His Majesty King Priyadasi, in the ninth year of his reign, conquered the Kalingas. One hundred and fifty thousand persons were thence carried away captive, one hundred thousand were there slain, and many times that number perished. Ever since the annexation of the Kalingas, His Majesty has zealously

protected the Law of Piety, has been devoted to that Law, and has proclaimed its precepts. His Majesty feels remorse on account of the conquest of the Kalingas, because, during the subjugation of a previously unconquered country, slaughter, death, and taking away captive of the people, necessarily occur, whereat His Majesty feels profound sorrow and regret." Asoka's pacifism was genuine, for he made no more wars; but it may be significant for our times to note that Mauryan pacifism arose only when the Empire had reached its natural boundaries. Two and a half years later Asoka joined the order of monks, and the rest of the reign was devoted to the spreading of Buddhist ideas throughout India, and even beyond its borders. "For more than two years and a half I was a lay disciple without exerting myself strenuously. A period of six years, or rather more than six years, has elapsed since I joined the order, and have strenuously exerted myself, and during this time the men who were, all over India, regarded as true, have been, with their Gods, regarded as untrue" (Minor Rock, Edict I.). The Emperor's membership of the Sangha was quite compatible with the continuance of his rule in his dominions. Upasampada ordination does not convey indelible orders, and men often take the vows for a short time, after which they return to civil life. In India an Emperor who retired from the world to be a homeless beggar would not lose the respect of his subjects, as he might do in England. Certainly the Emperor was a wholehearted convert. "Ye know, Reverend Sirs," he says to the Buddhist monks of Magadha in the Bhabra Edict towards the end of his life, "how great is my respect for, and devotion to, the Buddha, the Law, and the Assembly of the Clergy. Reverend Sirs, all that has been said by the Venerable Buddha has been well said."

By Asoka's labours Buddhism was transformed from an obscure local sect into a powerful religion under the patronage of the State. The change was greater than that made by Constantine in the Christian Church, for the Roman Emperor found the Church in a much more advanced state than the Buddhists had reached at the time of Asoka. We can trace with some degree of accuracy the latter's advance in his new religion, and we can pick out that in it which most appealed to him. From the time of his ordination he was a consistent vegetarian, and would never taste any but vegetable curries. This is not, indeed, a necessary rule of the Buddhist way of life, for Gautama himself ate meat and met his death from that cause. But Buddhists, like many other Indian sects, have always had a marked aversion from taking life, and Asoka was in this respect true to the Buddhist spirit. He prohibited in

his capital the slaughter of animals for sacrifice, and reduced to a minimum the supply of meat for his household. He gave up hunting, in which he had formerly taken delight, and, instead, he led the court on tours of sacred sites, where he marked the occasion of his visits by erecting stupas, or Buddhist relic-shrines, and by making gifts to the Sangha, though his bounty was not confined to Buddhists. "In times past Their Majesties used to go out on so-called tours of pleasure, during which hunting and other similar amusements used to be practised. His Majesty King Priyadasi, however, in the eleventh year of his reign, went out on the road leading to true knowledge, whence originated here tours devoted to piety, during which are practised the beholding of ascetics and Brahmans, with liberality to them, the beholding of elders, largess of gold, the beholding of the country and the people, proclamation of the Law of Piety, and discussion of the Law of Piety" (Edict VIII.). It will be seen from this extract that Asoka was free from the intolerance which we have come to associate with converts. Besides the support which he gave to the older Indian religions by gifts and by the praise of religious people, which is common in the Edicts, he went out of his way specially to assist with a grant of some caves for their head-quarters the Ajivikas, a sect of naked ascetics, probably to be identified with the Digambara Jains. The Emperor, indeed, valued tolerance for its own sake. "His Majesty King Priyadasi does reverence to men of all sects, whether ascetics or householders, by donations and various modes of reverence. His Majesty, however, cares not so much for donations or external reverence as that there should be a growth of the essence of the matter in all sects. . . . The root of it is restraint of speech—to wit, a man must not do reverence to his own sect by disparaging that of another man for trivial reasons" (Edict XII.). The divisions of Hinduism do not, indeed, issue in any such exclusiveness of doctrine or practice as would be found in religions which teach that God is active and that heaven is a positive bliss for the redeemed; but Christians might well lay to heart the fine thoughts of this Buddhist on toleration, and statesmen might learn from him that it is possible to be neutral between sects and religions without discriminating against any of them. There is something less admirable in the tone of complacency which certainly runs through the Edicts. Asoka had no intention that his good deeds should pass without notice. But it is as hard for Governments to be modest as to own themselves in the wrong; and in Buddhism the accumulation of merit is a religious duty, because the merit of good deeds destroys Karma and helps to prevent rebirth. Asoka

had at least a genuine devotion to his subjects. "All men are my children, and just as for my children I desire that they should enjoy all happiness and prosperity, so for all men I desire the like happiness and prosperity" (The Provincials' Edict). Are we not at once reminded of the Christmas Day broadcasts of our own George V. ?

The Emperor's religious ideals gave rise to a vigorous policy of social legislation. He developed the means of communication in his empire by building rest-houses for travellers and by planting shady trees along the road-side. Wells were dug and watering-places established where cattle and beasts of burden needed them. The Emperor undertook to hear causes at all times and seasons, and forbade unwarranted imprisonment and torture. There were no political prisoners, as in modern India, and no one suddenly disappeared from his family or suffered in any way for his religious convictions, as in Russia or Germany. Asoka did not abolish the death penalty, but there were many free pardons, and the list of capital crimes was reduced to very small proportions. "To prisoners convicted and sentenced to death a respite of three days is granted by me. During this interval the relatives of some at least of the condemned men will invite them to deep meditation, hoping to save their lives" (Edict IV.). Buddhism claims to have been the first religion to establish hospitals, and accordingly we find Asoka making provision for the growing of medicinal herbs and trees. His sanitary interest extended to animals. He issued a detailed code to regulate the treatment of animals which would almost have satisfied our R.S.P.C.A., for it prohibited the slaughter of some animals altogether and ordered close periods for others. Farming operations, such as the branding of horses and cattle, were strictly regulated, and the Government undertook to provide medicines for sick animals. These veterinary laws are the more remarkable when we consider, not only what is occasionally done on English farms, but also that Indian religion, though it has in most cases discouraged the taking of animal life, has not often had serious care for living animals.

In passing to Asoka's more direct work for the Buddhist order, we must keep in mind the fact that Buddhism does not aim at a close-knit society of believers in the manner of the Christian Church. Therefore, much that Asoka did for Buddhism may appear more loose in legislative texture than the work of a Christian ruler for his Church would have been. The Emperor inspired a number of missions to outlying parts of his dominions, and even to regions beyond his rule. He sent his own son, Mahendra, as the leader of the Buddhist Mission to Ceylon. Such missionary zeal is, of course, beyond the

utmost which we should expect of a Government which professed and called itself Christian. The most we expect of the British Government is that Civil Servants should give our missionaries fair play. Asoka built many stupas, or relic-shrines, and forms of worship were quickly developed for use at these sacred places. The Emperor himself organized "heavenly spectacles of processional cars, elephants, and illuminations," though he sought to simplify the ancient Brahman domestic ceremonies. He would stoutly have denied that the ordering of worship was the concern of the Church and not of the State, but there is no trace of compulsory Court or State religious ceremonies, such as jubilees, coronations, or assize sermons. The Buddhist monks were bidden to preach sermons on the Law of Piety, and other instructors were employed by the Government to spread Buddhist principles. There were assemblies of the Buddhist leaders every five years to a sort of "Lambeth Conference." "Everywhere in my dominions the lieges, and the Commissioners, and the District Officers must every five years repair to the General Assembly for the special purpose, in addition to other business, of proclaiming the Law of Piety, to wit, obedience to father and mother is good; liberality to friends, acquaintances, relatives, Brahmans, and ascetics is good; respect for the sacredness of life is good; avoidance of extravagance and violence of language is good" (Edict III.). The general oversight of religion was put into the hands of special officers called Censors of the Law of Piety, who were to keep monks and teachers up to their duties and also had powers to secure discipline in royal and princely households. This was something like a Ministry of Religion, which has no parallel in England, unless it be the Tudor Court of High Commission. The vague duties and arbitrary authority conferred upon the Censors must have tempted them, indeed, into the dubious courses which at length proved fatal to the Tudor Court, though we have no records of their history. Asoka was, in fact, no mere clericalist fanatically devoted to the Buddhist order; his religion was essentially that of a layman and a moralist. He cared little for outward adhesion to Buddhism in itself, and his moral ideals were published in a form consistent with many other systems of religion besides that of the Buddha. The teaching which he authorized was "strictly undenominational," and evidently had the same homely purpose in view as the "simple Bible teaching" of our Board of Education. Only one Edict, the Bhabra, is addressed expressly to Buddhist monks and deals exclusively with Buddhist affairs. There was no attempt to force the order upon the people, and we have no evidence to shew that anyone

gained Government favour by seeking the upasampada ordination. Moggaliputta, who was the Emperor's chief adviser in religion, does not appear in the Edicts, and there is nothing to shew that he had any influence outside the sphere of the affairs of his order.

Asoka's Edicts involve some critical problems. They do not mention the Noble Truths, the Eightfold Path, or the Chain of Causation, and what they call the Law of Piety does not correspond with the Buddhist Ten Commandments, or even with the Five Commandments required from laymen. Yet in the Pitakas, which are the canonical Scriptures of Buddhism, these things are the heart and soul of the system. The Bhabra Edict contains a list of books, not all of which are found in the Pitakas. We may conclude, therefore, that Buddhism as we know it had not yet come into being, and that the canon of Scripture was not yet complete. But it would seem highly probable that Asoka's favour, and the rapid expansion of Buddhist influence during his reign, helped greatly in the fixing of the form of the system; and there is evidence in the Pitakas themselves that they come from the time of the Mauryan supremacy. Buddhists hold that they owe their Scriptures to a series of Councils which decided upon the exact contents of the canon. There is a tradition that one of these Councils was held in Asoka's reign, though the Edicts are silent about it. It may very well, however, have taken place, and we may suppose that under so active and able a leader as the Emperor considerable progress was made at it towards settling the canon. The Bhabra Edict has, perhaps, a connection with this Council. It can hardly embody the results of the Council's deliberations, for in that case it would surely have given the Council's name as its authority. But it may well have been a preliminary draft of a canon, which the Emperor put out to gauge the force of Buddhist feeling about the books mentioned in it. We may compare the work of Constantine in connection with the Nicene decisions, and the influence of James I. upon the Authorized Version of the Bible.

The purpose of this paper has been to seek light on the problem of the State's dealings with religion. Asoka's work shews these dealings at their best. On the one side there was a high-minded and pious Emperor, genuinely zealous for the spiritual, as well as for the material, welfare of his people. And it would be hard to over-estimate the importance of the moral character of the Government for the problem of Church and State. Even the most extreme of believers in theocracy will swallow all sorts of high-handed actions and claims from a ruler to whom he must needs give moral respect. But when

the tone of the Government is low, and politics is thought to be a "dirty game," unrest and a demand for freedom will soon arise among the religious. On the other side, in Asoka's case we find a system of religion, simple, loose-knit, leading naturally to a quiet acquiescence in the aims and rule of the Government. In its detachment from worldly ambitions, and because of the inoffensiveness of its monks, Buddhism is the best adapted of all religions, except that of Imperial China, to be an "Established Church," and it has, in fact, at all times depended much on royal favour. The monk will not criticize Government officials, nor is he likely to resist the State in the name of conscience. The Buddhist will do what the State tells him and give no trouble. No Government wants those who have "turned the world upside down" to "come here also"; and there is no doubt that criticism by the clergy of our own Government is much resented by politicians. At the same time the favour extended to such a community as the Sangha will insure to the State the sanction of religious respectability, without which the Law will not win obedience. Sheer tyranny cannot last long in any State, and sooner or later religious sanctions must be brought in to ease the tension between ruler and subject. Christians should not underrate the importance of these sanctions for the public welfare, since the modern official class is as keenly alive to it as Asoka himself. It is for their own need, and not merely in order to patronize religion, that the Mayor and Borough Council want to come to church. Even godless Russia will throw up an Asoka in due course. The trouble is that the Christian Church is so very much more active and self-reliant than the Buddhist Sangha. Christians insist upon holding so many inconvenient beliefs, and their consciences are so very stiff. They interpret the Will of God in their own way, and offer their doctrine to the State as a settled thing to take or leave without alteration. But other rulers beside Asoka have thought themselves capable of defining the obligations of religion and the beliefs which they allow their subjects to hold, and in the case of Christianity the definitions will probably result in a thinner gruel than the Church will ever feel to be sustaining. The vague "Almighty God" of the King's Speech in Parliament is never quite enough for the zealous Churchman. Buddhism in its purity ignored God; and thus to all intents and purposes Asoka had no superior; in his emancipation from Karma he was above all that is called divine, and, in point of fact, his Edicts do not even mention God. Christians, on the other hand, will tell their rulers that they are as nothing compared with the Almighty, who exalts and destroys States as He thinks fit. In the title of the British

Monarch the phrase " High and Mighty " refers to the Monarch himself: in the Book of Common Prayer it is used of the King of Kings. God, the Ruler of Princes: or the Supreme State—this is the final crux; and hence the endless tension in our midst of Church and State.

J. W. Parker.

ASPECTS OF THE PROBLEM AND TRAGEDY OF DE LAMENNAIS AND FR. TYRRELL

In his expulsion from the Roman Church Lamennais received the final answer to the affirmation that the essential thing about the Church was not doctrine but life.

To affirm in 1834 that experience precedes dogma was the height of indiscretion. Newman had not yet written his essay upon the " Development of Christian Doctrine." The spiritual ancestor of many Modernists was yet an Anglican. Lamennais, who strove with might and main to advance Ultramontanism, who aimed at the most complete destruction of Gallicanism and regarded a National Church as the fount of all evil, was himself eventually slain by the very cause which he espoused. It has been observed that he remains one of the outstanding examples of " the tremendous strain imposed by an over-centralized despotic authority in religion."*

His reaction from the ideas of 1789 had been extremely violent and had issued in his identification, as Dr. Sparrow-Simpson has put it, of " the collective reason with centralized authority at Rome, and this had failed him; for it had declared against the freedom of mankind. That was his view."† Thus Lamennais lost his faith in the whole Roman system; nay, almost even in God. The answer to the problem of Lamennais is one of the most momentous, it agitates the world still—namely, the nature of corporate personality. His difficulty was the difficulty of Tyrrell and all Classical Modernists; the difficulty, dare we say it, even to some extent of Newman.

In his essay on the *Development of Christian Doctrine*, Newman makes it more or less clear that religion is a social thing; yet even so his Development ends in Rome. If he is to be placed in the category of those who maintain a Theism of Personalism, his divergence from Westcott, who though an intuitivist may also be placed at times in this category, is

* Sparrow-Simpson, *French Catholics in the Nineteenth Century*, chap. i., p. 40.
† *Ibid.*, chap. i., p. 37.

extremely interesting, for both men had a grasp of the organic nature of the Church. Westcott's essay on *Aspects of Positivism in Relation to Christianity*,* wherein he criticizes Newman, gives some indication of the two men; the Personalism of Westcott is, as it were, only for the moment when, with Newman, he appeals from sheer reason to "the whole capacity of the living soul." He does not rest there. There is nothing of Newman's intense individualism, which he himself notes in his criticism of Newman.

Thus the Intuitivism and Mysticism of Westcott is of another order from that of Newman. Westcott is keenly conscious of the difficulty that all Personalism finds in determining a clear issue with regard to the individual and social factors. Criticising both Newman and Comte, he remarks: "The one, Comte's, outlook passes into Secularism, the other, Newman's, into Mysticism, while the fulness of truth springs from the co-ordination of both." And again he writes: "Since the Reformation, the general tendency of religious influences has been to individualism; and thus a bold and exclusive enunciation of the complementary aspect cannot but contribute to the restoration of the true harmony between personal and social religion which Christianity, as we believe, alone contains." Such passages as these not only serve to indicate Westcott's own position, but point to that strange residuum of Protestantism in Newman which Westcott observed and which goes far to substantiate the affirmation on the part of some Eastern Orthodox writers that Protestantism is the logical consequences of Romanism. Thus a fundamental divergence appears between these two men, though at certain moments we almost expect them to draw like conclusions. Here also the fact becomes clear that though both were nurtured in the same Communion their two respective traditions are very different, and in one sense Westcott's position may, in the light of to-day, be said to have a more agreeable and deeply tinctured Catholic complexion. That deep penetrating insight and comprehensive grasp of the Gospel in all the fulness of its Christological significance, which is so characteristic of Westcott and which also gives to his writings great soteriological value, appears to be absent in Newman, who, in his reactions from the doctrine of Justification by Faith, is often cold and intensely forensic, a fact to which the late Dr. Alexander Whyte† in a sympathetic study called attention. Yet for all this Newman was conscious of the meaning and value of an organic conception of the Church. Deep down somewhere in his being, however, there is rooted the fear

* Appendix I.: "The Gospel of the Resurrection," p. 254.

† Alexander Whyte: *Newman, An Appreciation.* 1901. See pp. 103-104.

whereunto the conception may lead and how in its social aspect it may be ultimately reconciled to that innate and Absolute Theism to which he clung, and which gives so strange a colour to his own Mysticism in contrast to Bishop Westcott. It is interesting to note that to-day the more flexible conception of the organic nature of the Church, the conception of Maurice Westcott, of Soloviev and Komiakov, is rapidly gaining ground, and even within the Roman Church itself emerges in the writings of Karl Adam, Pribilla and others. As time goes on it is probable that the issues of Modernism and Liberalism will appear in the light of difficult phases on the way along which Newman hesitated to walk.

It looks in many ways as if Westcott and Maurice will, after all, have the last word. This much at least is certain, that there can be no real recovery of Christian unity until the organic conception of the Church is thoroughly understood and realized in relation to the Person of our Lord and the doctrine of the Holy Ghost.

The Modernist Movement was essentially a Theological Movement, and yet its implications were such that it could not raise Governmental questions. Mr. Laski is right in referring the ultimate issue to " a discussion as to the nature of a particular form of Community."

The gradual advance of democratic ideas has strengthened the Institutional notion, and has, moreover, involved both Church and State in a number of complicated situations. Especially is this the case in England, where it is a common error to confound the Collective with the doctrine of the Church. The Church of God is emphatically not the Collective. Democracy can very easily assume all the characteristics of the worst form of Absolutism. It is essential that the error of making the Collective a God should be avoided. It is so easy to transfer the notions of current political philosophy and apply to them the Government and Administration of the Church.

If this be done eventually the Church will declare against the freedom of its members in the interest of a completely Centralized Authority. The Collectivist doctrine is in entire antithesis to the organic conception of the Body of Christ.*

Dr. Inge has said: " Political history, whether Secular or Ecclesiastical, is an almost unrelieved tragedy. There never yet has been a hopeful experiment which did not break down after a time," and " There has never been a constitution which

* *Cf.* Berdyaev's distinction between Community and Society: " One cannot realize a community in Christ by the same methods as one builds a Society " (*The Christian and the Social Order*, Sobornost No. 9, March, 1934, p. 9).

did not bear within itself the seeds of its own decay and dissolution." The problem of the Ideal State yet remains the greatest of all problems. Every form and constitution, Ecclesiastical or Civil, is but some aspect of our successive attempts to solve the problem of the One and the Many. The Christian Church in all its forms has reflected from age to age* aspects of the very human attempt to solve the problem of Government.

Half the troubles and difficulties which have arisen from time to time in the Christian Church are at rock bottom political and have mainly to do with Governmental questions. The very unity of the Church has been broken by sharp differences concerning Government and Administration.† The eternal problem which has confronted reformers of all types still confronts us to-day—namely, the place of Liberty in organized life—if, indeed, such life can be called life at all. It cannot be too strongly asserted that the form of State Socialism towards which we are moving even in England might have an effect upon the Church as baneful as anything Feudalism produced. Already the advocates of this trend are to be heard upon the housetop, and Collectivist organization is believed to be the panacea for every political, social, economic and religious difficulty. It is not surprising that there are many Christians even who mistake the social Utopia for the doctrine of the Kingdom of God. This Kingdom cannot be discovered to man apart from the King, and for that reason alone it can never become an end in itself. Should it do so it produces an order of society less than human. Tyrrell said: "To believe in the living historical Church is to believe that by its corporate life and labour it is slowly realizing the ideas and ends in whose service it was founded."

Thus Catholicism is belief in the historic Catholic Community, the Community which emerged from the Apostolic preaching of the Gospel. "The Church's Divine Commission is to teach and propagate a new life, a new love, a new hope, a new spirit." Here the Church is presented as the actual Vicar of Christ and organ of the Spirit which He gave. In a certain measure the Church in the world is to be what Christ was and must both witness to and plead God's cause. "Within the Church, where the experience of so many peoples and so many centuries are united, the Gospel Spirit seeks experimentally to embody itself in the best form of religious institution." Thus it is affirmed

* *Cf.* Case of Oliver Cromwell. Morley, *Oliver Cromwell*, 1653-58, book v.

† *Cf.* Morley, *Oliver Cromwell*, book i., chap. iii., p. 61: "Tonnage and poundage and predestination, ship-money and election, habeas corpus and justification by faith, all fell into line."

that "Catholicism is both unchanging spirit and growing organism, within certain limits the Church is one and undivided, a single organism . . . there is one life, one will, one mind." But this conception which haunted Tyrrell,* as it continues to haunt many others, bears little relation to the actual Church. It is hardly either "the Church of the Middle Ages or the Church of Constantine or the Church of the Apostles"; if indeed it were there would be perhaps less division and trouble about its constitution. The fact is that there is a gulf between what the Church *is*—ought to be—and what it is in fact and human knowledge. When the Institutional Church is considered with a view to the nature of the best form of Government, there are few who do not react in relation to it from the dread of spiritual Absolutism in some form, for all feel that this may violently conflict with the Christian idea of free and creative personality. It is the same with the State. Ecclesiastical Institutionalism and State Institutionalism are quickly seen to be but two sides of one coin. When have either ever indeed realized our ideal? When could either ever help being an Institution potentially?

In the case of the Church the trouble lies in the passage from the ideal to the actual. This is an old problem connected with being and doing. Unfortunately a Spiritual Movement when Institutionalized has to come down to earth, and then the ordinary human being has his say. Then through his management the Institutional dominates the Spiritual, and the order of the day becomes Government by machinery, truth by machinery, Grace and Salvation by machinery, Prayer by machinery. The ordinary man with his desire for finality demands salvation on the lowest terms, and he very often obtains it. Secular aims and interests then control the Church, and because the people love to have it so there is little or no opposition. Like the Archbishop in Bernard Shaw's *Saint Joan*, there is much talk of "ruling men for the good of their souls"—that is, in the interest of the Institution. On the whole we tend to forget about the Fall and expect too much of mankind. If there is a tendency for the Christian religion to become less and less a spiritual influence and more and more Institutional and organizational, we know where to lay the blame!

Dr. Inge has said: "The religion of Christ has a history, but the stream runs underground and its fortunes are rather entangled with than determined by the great political institution which has alternately sheltered and repressed it." The

* With reference to Fr. Tyrrell, I am indebted to the valuable article by Mr. H. C. Corrance published a number of years back and which I am now unfortunately unable to trace.

danger which attends a refusal to recognize this at least in some degree is bound to lead to an almost insuperable difficulty.

Tyrrell believed in development, but he saw it as an ideal process, and in consequence the whole development of the Christian Institution in history and in fact constituted something which he could not overcome. In a very real sense he was a victim of the nineteenth-century notion of Progress. Theologically, in his effort to deal with the distinction between nature and supernature, the popular dualism so greatly enhanced by the march of Institutionalism, he fell almost into a doctrine of Divine Immanence in its most extreme form—there is almost the suggestion of a God who suffers, dies, and rises again in an endless cycle. This more than anything else determined the opposition of the Roman Ecclesiastical Authority. Thus he found himself in opposition to the Church which claimed to impose its theological and doctrinal conclusions upon him. The Autocratic power of Pope and Curia were to him the antithesis of the Gospel. "Easier to squeeze blood from a stone than the spirit of absolutism from the spirit of Christ." He does not seem to have made sufficient allowance for the fact that so long as the Church was a small body it was in some degree possible to realize his ideal. When it became a large body it had to be organized and governed. Finally, as the multitude of its members demanded little by little a great share in its affairs, it could not but become infected by the world. It cannot be forgotten, however, that the Church was called upon to solve a difficult problem. How was it to exercise authority and jurisdiction over its members? How was it to hold out against the world to win it or exercise dominion over it? For a time the best way did seem by concentration of the power in the hands of one man. The organic conception of earlier days had been almost lost sight of. Democratic methods were not possible. "Even a State cannot remain democratic and administer the affairs of an Empire." Further, the democratic notions which coloured Tyrrell's mind had not yet come to fruition—a fact which he seems strangely to have overlooked when he turned to Church history. It cannot further be forgotten that the supernatural ruler of the world was conceived in autocratic terms. When Christ founded the Church it was believed that He delegated His authority to a Vicar—the first Vicar may have been in some sense the Church as a corporate body, but it was inevitable that the titular head of that body should in the end even by common consent concentrate almost absolute power in his hands. And in this connexion it has been pointed out that Presbyterianism, Episcopalianism and Papalism differ not so much in kind but

in degree. Popery, it has been said, is essentially a form of Church Government, and in this connexion it is worth recalling that in the seventeenth century Nonconformists were liable to be called Jesuits! Rome, Constantinople, Canterbury and Geneva are still, in spite of themselves, fragmentary aspects in varying degrees of Popery in the Governmental sense.

Reactions from Popery are to be seen in the development of the Divine Right of Kings, the Leviathan of Hobbes and the Gallicanism of Bossuet, as well as in the modern notion of the Omnipotent State. In all these the cloak of religion has been gradually cast off and that of Civil Absolutism assumed. To envisage the Church as Tyrrell envisaged it, with unanimous consent obtained through Churches and their representatives, is to fall back upon the Conciliar idea. This grand idea failed at Constance. Its main defect is that it supposes that Institutionally better results may be obtained by means of a Collective. Whether this is possible or not as a matter of pure politic is another matter. It is, however, bound to fail where there is no grasp of the Church as an organism of love and where the frailties of man are not sufficiently taken into consideration. Spontaneous agreement can only spring ultimately from a common religious experience—if we may dare to use the term. It can never be manufactured round a council table, and when this is relied upon alone and breaks down anarchy must follow unless Absolutism in some form supervenes.*

Failure to recognize these facts drove both Lamennais and Tyrrell into a tragic conflict which darkened their latter days and drove them from the Church which they had both served and loved.

In the political sphere a classic example of disintegration is depicted in Lamennais. Later, Tyrrell exemplified the same process at work in the Churchly and Theological sphere. Lamennais embodied in himself the revolt against the self-sufficiency of man issuing in "the spirit of independence" erecting "anarchy into a social principle." It is clear that Society cannot "sanction its own annihilation."† Lamennais pointed back to "the essential basis of an adequate social order." So far as Christianity was concerned, caught as he was in the disintegrating process and not uninfluenced by the teaching of Rousseau, though he chastised the latter's plea for natural religion, and fell back upon the absolute conception of Ecclesiastical Unity, which he forthwith proceeded to expound in

* *Cf.* the interesting case of Ireton and The Levellers (Morley, book iii., chap. iii., p. 227, "The Officers as Politicians"). See also "Study of Ireton" in *Charles I. and Cromwell*, by G. M. Young, p. 115.

† *Cf.* Laski, *Authority in the Modern State*, chap. iii., p. 202.

terms of Liberalism, he threw great stress upon the hierarchical principle and the subordination of the individual to it. At heart he was a monist, and his whole conception of Church unity was governed by that. He was led step by step to exalt Rome, and finally the Pope, and so passed into the realm of the most extreme Ultramontanism. In violent reaction from the extreme individualism of his time he pitted his conception of Catholicism against the State, demanding for the Church the most complete autonomy. Thus he was a prominent figure in the band who condemned the Revolution. Unfortunately the whole theory which Lamennais built up to support Ultramontanism was that which contained within itself the very thing calculated to bring it crashing to the ground. His fight with Protestant individualism was, as Mr. Laski has shewn, a fight with Cartesianism, the "parent of social disorganization."* It is essential to grasp this. Rationalism could not solve "the central problems by which man is faced." Lamennais threw tremendous weight upon mere certainty and the unanimous testimony of mankind; he associated them so absolutely with the Roman Church as to force the uncontestable truth of that Communion. Moreover, the whole theory was bound up, unfortunately for Lamennais, with the possibility of Liberalism. So soon as he could be shewn that the majority were not with him, he must of necessity go down. His theory was in effect a sheer piece of Protestantism; it was the expression of himself; he believed it, and therefore it must be so. It staked all upon the Unified Sovereignty of Rome; thus he proposed to safeguard Orthodoxy. In the name of Orthodoxy he opposed the principles of Liberalism. Further, in turning his eyes from the Church and State to the mass of mankind he set foot upon the first rung of Liberalism—a doubt insinuated itself into his mind with regard to Rome. She temporized with the world. Lamennais became a Liberal. Thus he began a crusade in the name of Liberty and Liberal Catholicism was born. He affirmed the cause of the Church and the cause of Society to be one and the same. He tried to justify this by an appeal to Rome, and Rome would have none of him. Thence he was swept onward into the tide of unbelief. The antinomies resulting from that which he conceived to be the actual fact destroyed him. That on his expulsion from the Church he devoted himself to mankind is significant. Since he heralded a Revolution in both Church and State his work was looked upon as a veritable Apocalypse of Satan. The struggle, however, went on and found expression in the Modernist Movement, which at rock bottom raised the whole problem of Church Government.

* Laski, *Authority in the Modern State*, chap. iii., p. 212.

"It was a discussion of a particular form of community that was in reality the main issue."* Tyrrell saw that fact; he too urged Catholicism was a life, and he too foundered on the absolutism of Rome. All values of personality, so he thought, were swallowed up in the Pope. The Christian people were the "true and immediate Vicarius Christi."† So he struck the contrast between Autocracy and Democracy.‡

It is not necessary to go into the case of Tyrrell further, save to remark that the authority which had so sharply defined its attitude in the Syllabus of 1864 proclaiming that the social cause must be worked out within its own terms and not, as it were, *ad extra*, condemned him. In the famous *Paroles d'un Croyant* Lamennais unburdened his soul, and it reads, as Mr. Laski most justly observes, like a "lyrical version of the Communist Manifesto":§ ". . . the real problem by which he was confronted was the problem of government . . . he had come to the stage where it is necessary to distinguish between the collective conscience of Christian Society—the general will which lay beneath the appearance of evil and misunderstanding—and the consciously formulated practice of those who actually govern it." He had come to disbelieve that the Church could be fully represented by its ministers. What she was, no other body of men could claim to be. She was essentially a brotherhood of a life to be lived upon certain principles, and the fundamental test of her worth was the regulation of her conduct in terms of those principles. That was why he was prepared to reject the State. "As a consistent Christian he could not regard himself as linked to what was in idea neither religious nor free."‖ The application of all this to Rome was fatal. Ultimately he was wrestling with the "gigantic problem," "the nature of corporate personality."¶ His contention that what mattered about the Church was its life and not its doctrine, his anti-legalism, all this we know by the legacy he left. In actuality he came into the most violent collision with both Church and State. He could not bring himself to see that, "disguise it how we will, the Sovereignty of the State will mean, in the long run, the Sovereignty of the rulers who govern it."** Again, he discovered that "when the government of men is despotic, religion is too valuable an instrument in the security of servitude to be left untrammelled."†† He was left to the examination of the political basis of despotic government, and thence to its rejection. In a word, he asked both Church

* *Ibid.*, p. 267. † *Ibid.*, p. 269. ‡ *Salus Populus.*
§ Laski, *Authority in the Modern State*, chap. iii., p. 255.
‖ *Ibid.*, p. 261. ¶ *Ibid.*, p. 239.
** *Ibid.*, p. 265. †† *Ibid.*, p. 259.

and State to surrender too much, the very sinews of real politic. Like many others, he became on this account a public enemy.

Lamennais moved in the realm of strongly felt subjective need. In this he was not alone, and in such a state of affairs the Fideism which appeared in him, and later Modernism, and also something that looks very like Gnosticism, shewed themselves within the frontiers of the Church.

The fundamental relationship of Americanism to the type of thought expressing itself both in Lamennais and, later, in Tyrrell—that is, to Modernism—may be clearly seen in so far as it was bound up with those ideas which are to be associated with 1789. But it is to be noticed that the victory of Rousseau did not secure in the New World a passion for uniformity. The endemic ill to which Lord Morley refers as touching France found no outlet in sheer despotism either on behalf of Church or State. While European Catholicism opposed Liberalism and Democracy, American Catholicism accommodated itself. Again, the strong sense of individuality, the need for variety which Father Hecker and others communicated to American Catholicism, his strong insistence upon active virtues in contrast to the tradition which Rousseau represented, spread far and wide. Cardinal Gibbons, Spalding and Archbishop Ireland were influenced by this school. There was the tendency to put little stress upon dogmatic form, and this peculiarity of Americanism led it finally outside the Roman Church to undiluted Activism and an immense wave of social activity. "A religion of humanity grafted on Christianity." Americanism readily coalesced with Liberal Protestantism.

It is not difficult to see why Americanism was condemned by Rome. The Americanists presented a menace to the Church in so far as they proposed to substitute eventually a man-made Gospel. Their doctrines ultimately involved Humanism in place of the Gospel of God as revealed in the Incarnate Lord. There was a complete sundering between the relationship of God and man potentially contained in the Americanist Movement. Unfortunately its effect upon English Christianity has been serious, and it led many into the error of Lamennais and Tyrrell by confounding the Christian Community with Liberal Democracy. The Christian Community springs from the Divine Agape, wherein its authority and commission is most justly made known through the act of Redemption and by means of the Holy Spirit, who abides in the Church and enables its members to have access to the fulness of the Divine Life itself. Along this line alone it would not appear possible to achieve any satisfactory conception of the relationship of the Christian Community to the problem of Government.

That Ecclesiastical Government, truly Apostolic Government, must have its authority and commission grounded in the Gospel—that is, to have authority and commission from the Lord. This alone avails to secure a moral check upon human aberrations which still abound concerning the guidance of the Holy Spirit, or Fideism of the type which would seek to syncretize the whole of Christendom into an amorphous body held together on Collective principles and dominated by a spiritual absolutism issuing from an inner circle of Illuminati. This, since it throws so much weight upon experience, takes little note of reason, and so might well issue in further sectarian atomization. It also suggests a form of Catholicism based upon natural religion, and by means of an elaborate symbolism establishes something very akin to Gnosticism of an up-to-date variety. Such a conglomeration as this is far removed from the Christian Community or True Catholicism. It is incapable of providing an adequate substitution for it in the face of the world which, in the name of Religion of its own making, has dethroned God and set up in His place the image and likeness of man clothed in the trappings of complete self-sufficiency and pride.

As a matter of fact, such a system is but the apotheosis of the false spiritualism which now finds itself at such difficulty to bridge the gulf between the Life of the Spirit and that of Humanity. The world knows it to be no Gospel and naturally prefers to go on its own way with the Gospel of pure Humanism and its relative belief in progress. This doctrine must eventually issue in some form of Communism or *Fascismo*.

We have endeavoured to shew the pass to which the disintegration has come. From the fundamental unity contained in the Trinitarian conception the Christian Community has broken up into a pluralism which has actualized itself in Sectarianism. In this process false spirituality has played a large part, leaving as the only alternative Absolutism in relation to Society or even the Church itself.

The City of God cannot be so reconstructed. Only in terms of the Divine Agape lies the approximate resolution of the fundamental problem of Religious and Political Philosophy with regard to both the Christian Community and the State.

IVAN R. YOUNG.

MISCELLANEA

CHRISTIANITY IN 1936

Dr. Heiler's magazine, *Eine heilige Kirche,* publishes a survey of the present state of the Churches in the January-March number (M. 2: Ernst Reinhardt, München), written by authorities in the different fields, which makes one feel: "They do these things better in Germany." To begin with, that so frank a discussion of German problems should be allowed to be printed in Munich is in itself an encouraging sign. Also the whole outlook is œcumenical—Roman Catholic, Orthodox, and Protestant writers combining in one book and shewing wonderful unanimity of outlook.

Professor Hoffmann of Breslau asks what are the most important happenings in the Roman Catholic Church, reminding us, however, that what we suffer may be more important than what we do. He puts first the call to self-knowledge and penitence, which has been sounded by events in Spain. He confesses that the Church has not trusted the proletariat, that the higher clergy have leaned towards the upper classes. In Germany Catholicism is both widening and deepening. Debarred from political and institutional activities, the clergy are becoming pastors first and foremost. The apostolate of the laity is being made a reality, the priesthood of all Christians is being taught, religious education is no longer left to State and Church, but is taken up by the parents.

Perhaps the most significant thing of all is the preoccupation of the Papacy with the Far East and its determination that the Church there shall be genuinely national and not dependent on the West for either personnel or financial support.

Last year saw the Catholic Church "as not a triumphing but a suffering Church . . . not ruling but serving." Another Roman Catholic article emphasizes the return to Bible and Liturgy; the early Church is now the model.

Next we learn about the Old Catholics and the dangers arising from the influx of nationally-minded German Catholics. Numbers are increasing everywhere; there are 50,000 Old Catholics in Austria, and new churches are being built in Holland and Switzerland.

The papers on German Protestantism are too technical to be quoted from here. But the combination of firmness with determination to make the best of the State is attractive; it is good to learn of a relaxation in the rigour of the press laws. Particularly interesting is the evidence for Swedish influence on German Lutheranism. The Church of Sweden herself is largely occupied with the better use of cathedrals, a new hymn-book, a movement for keeping churches always open, and the demand that the clergy shall not be compelled to marry divorced persons.

English-speaking countries are badly represented by one article only, by a German lady on the Church of England, apparently based on one Church newspaper.

The contributions which will be read most eagerly are those dealing with Russia. One, by a Russian in Paris, is based largely on rumour and hearsay, though a good deal is taken from official sources. The patriarchial paper of Moscow is still published, though unobtainable in

the West. Persecutions continue and more churches have been closed. But the faithful, when deprived of the ministrations of priests, spontaneously develop new ways of expressing corporate devotion.

The other paper, by Dr. Hendrix of Dortrecht (Holland), describes a recent visit to the Russian Church. In Leningrad the few open churches are well cared for, some have been recently restored. When a church is open all day, a priest is always in attendance. He was present at a Baptism, and saw the register carefully filled in. There seemed a breath of new life everywhere, "the very worst is over." The services were as beautiful as ever, but filled with supernatural joy and tenderness.

In Moscow, too, the newly-renovated churches filled him with joy. In one church a choir of forty to fifty men and women sang Vespers very beautifully. In another he saw many children communicating and families embracing one another with indescribable joy after receiving the mysteries.

The Metropolitan Sergius was not to be seen, but Dr. Hendrix had many talks with his secretary, the archpriest Lebedew, from which he got the impression that things were a little easier. The "Living Church" has almost died out, and its adherents have largely returned to orthodoxy. Everything is on a very small scale. Only some forty churches are open in Moscow. The worst problem is the education of the clergy, since no institutions are allowed to exist. But, as the secretary said, "We do without training colleges. Did the old Church in the first time of all know schools for priests, deacons, or bishops? The office goes on, that is what matters." The Church looks forward, not back. *Incipit vita nova*, filled with Easter joy unspeakable. "Has the Church had difficulties in Russia? Certainly! Will things be better in the future? The faithful, with whom I talked, hope, pray, believe that they will. But, whatever happens, in many ways the Russian Church is a pattern for Christians in the West—a Church life-imparting, filled with joy, full of grace."

Dr. Kahle in one of the papers quotes Cardinal Faulhaber's saying, "Vox temporis vox Dei," and interprets it as meaning that "we must hear what the beat of the time-clock, directed by God, has to say to us." The book leaves the impression of European Churches facing troubles, compared with which our English difficulties are trivial, not only with faith, but with courage and joy.

> "I proved thee also: at the waters of strife.
> Thou calledst upon me in troubles, and I delivered thee:
> And heard thee what time as the storm fell upon thee."

W. K. L. C.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Les Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales.

The larger part of the December issue of 1936 consists of a study by Dom Anselm Robeyns, from the point of view of the Liturgical Movement, of topics treated at the Sixth Catholic Congress at Malines last September. The conditions of the Church in Belgium appear as very similar to our own, and the suggestions for meeting them are therefore full of useful hints. The central thought is the revival of the sense of the parish, both as the local unit of the Body of Christ and as the means of sancti-

fication for the faithful. Of this the Mass, understood, commented on, and actively participated in by the laity, is the concrete manifestation. Among other subjects discussed were the co-ordination of departmental activities, such as Guilds; the use of the Liturgy and of the Bible as the basis of preaching; and the parts of celebrant, Schola (or choir) and congregation in the music of the Church.

The issue of February, 1937, is more theological. It opens with the first part of an admirable and characteristic exposition by Dr. Karl Adam of the dogmatic foundations of the Liturgy, and a later article by Dom B. Capelle expounds the pure Christianity of the Liturgy, emphasizing its importance as a means of teaching the fulness of the Faith. Among notes and documents is an outline of a method for Quiet Days or Annual Retreat of a parochial Guild, based on the Liturgical ideas of the season, and the actual text of the Proper of the Sunday Mass.

With each issue now appears a small popular Supplement, *La Vie Liturgique*, suggesting practical means of applying liturgical principles in parish life. Thus, the March paper describes "The Holy Week in a Rural Parish," a method of making the ceremonies of Palm Sunday and Holy Week in the true sense congregational.

H. DE C.

Analecta Bollandiana. Tomus liv. Fasc. iii et iv.

The present number is, at least to English readers, less interesting than usual. It contains, however, an important article entitled "Contributions Récentes a l'Hagiographic de Rome et d'Afrique," which shows how much has been done in recent years by Italian archæologists to throw light on the antiquities, especially the Christian antiquities, of Italy and North Africa. An article on "Une Copte de S. Jean de Lycopolis" shows that this late and legendary life is able to throw light on the earliest Greek texts of the *History of the Monks* and the *Lausiac History of Palladius*. Of the two hundred pages of the current number, no less than eighty-four contain short notices of *Publications Hagiographiques*, an elastic term which includes any historical work throwing light on Church History. It is for the student a most useful feature of the Review.

C. P. S. C.

The October issue of the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* opens with an important article by Father Lebon on the ancient creeds in the Chalcedonian definition. As it runs to no less than sixty-nine pages it is very exhaustive. Its main merit is that its author confines himself rigidly to the texts of the documents he investigates, and this merit must be examined with the utmost care in order to do justice to a remarkable article. Father Mollat offers a contribution to the better understanding of the judicial administration of the Roman Church during the fourteenth century. He, too, confines himself to the study of the actual documents. Father Martin writes a short note on Proclus of Constantinople and Nestorius. There is an elaborate list of the articles on the leading European magazines on all matters likely to stir the attention of the readers of this important Review, and no student of ecclesiastical history can afford to ignore this valuable set of summaries. There is also a carefully classified list of the works published on the history of the Church and on all kindred matters, and it is as accurate as it is exhaustive. We are full of admiration of this valuable issue.

R. H. M.

REVIEW

CHRISTIAN MORALITY. By H. H. Henson, Bishop of Durham. Oxford University Press. 12s. 6d.

These lectures are pure joy to read for their style alone. There is the vigour and weight of the seventeenth century combined with the precision and balance of the eighteenth. If only the thought were more of the twentieth and less of the nineteenth century, the Bishop of Durham would have done what is most wanted in this age, namely, stated the case for Christian morality as the morality for all men at all times and in every place, natural, developing, final. It is not an easy case to make within the regulations of Lord Gifford's will, since the question as to how far it is at once developing and final depends upon the prior question of its relation to the Christian revelation.

The Bishop sets out to prove that "the morality which Christ's religion properly requires is precisely that which the conscience and reason of modernly civilized men approve." Unfortunately neither of these terms is easy to define. Moreover, it would seem that the modernly civilized man is being called in question not only by the morality of the New Testament, but by his own conscience and reason. Failure to take account of this makes the thought of the book appear to belong more to the nineteenth century than to the twentieth.

"I am concerned with Christian morality as the climax or perfected version of natural morality, the norm of ethics, which, consciously or unconsciously, men must needs accept as they advance in civilization, the standard by which civilized men will finally judge the religions which claim their acceptance." But in the Bible, Christian morality appears in the form of a Law which all men are called upon to observe, but which none can observe without a radical change of heart. It confronts every man with the demand for conversion. It is not really sufficient to say that Jesus made good His claim not to destroy but to fulfil the Law of Moses by transforming the current Jewish morality, making it universal instead of national; rectifying its perspectives by presenting human duty in the true order of obligation; abolishing the inequality of the sexes by bringing the female sex frankly and fully within the social covenant. Jesus fulfilled the Law of Moses by making it possible for men to keep it. That is surely the answer to the question, "Could civilized morality survive the abolition of Christianity?" which is faced

at the end of the Lectures. Christian morality is not so much the standard by which civilized men will judge other religions, but the standard by which civilized men themselves are judged.

It is quite true that this judgment is taking place to-day in the sphere of family life, national life, international life, and within all these in the industrial order. And in each case the issue is whether or no there is a divine sanction of which Christianity lays hold, which guarantees what is truly natural, and is capable of development. The last half of the book is given over to an examination of the problem of sexual morality, of racial conflict, of civil allegiance, and of industrialism, four subjects upon which "there is an apparent, and perhaps widening, breach between the conduct which Christianity requires and that which is now common among non-Christians."

The chapter on Sexual Morality illustrates the difficulty which is felt all through, that it is the supernatural character of the Christian religion which makes the morality both natural and final, only you must not say so. For while it is well said that "in grounding monogamy on the Creator's original intention, Jesus proclaimed it to be the truly natural form of sexual relation, and invested it with religious sanctions," yet this proclamation was made in the context of the proclamation of the Kingdom of God, and depends for its realization upon entry into the Kingdom of God.

With regard to the State, and the problem of war, it is perfectly true to say that "the essential problem is how to restrain the lawlessness of States, and to vindicate in the sphere of international policy the authority of the moral law." But it is not quite true to say that Christian morality has failed to provide any solution. The laws of national life which were given to one nation are for all nations, and if they were observed, they would undoubtedly restrain the lawlessness of nations. They are not observed because the claims of the Kingdom of God are not recognized, not because they are not offered as a solution.

The Bishop of Durham is perfectly aware of this difficulty, as his Preface to the Lectures shews, and it is due to the fact that these are Gifford Lectures. But it is this which makes the book not quite the statement that is so much needed upon this whole subject. It is a statement, however, and in the grand manner, and worthy of a careful attention.

J. A. Ramsbotham.

NOTICES

THE AUTHORSHIP OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL. By John Donoran, S.J. Edited by Rev. E. F. Sutcliffe, S.J. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 10s. 6d.

For the majority of enquirers into Gospel origins, the authorship of St. John's Gospel is still perhaps an open question, and such will welcome the learned defence of the traditional position. Father Donoran has set himself to deal with every argument that is commonly brought against the authorship of John the Apostle, the son of Zebedee, and shews that, weighed against tradition, they are indecisive or capable of quite a different interpretation. It is true that the Gospel may have passed through various stages, and the last chapter been added as an after-thought; but "what is absolutely certain is the identity of mind and hand behind it all from first to last." There is inevitably in an edited work like this a certain lack of co-ordination, but the careful reader will find every argument discussed within these pages. One may regret that the question of the Person of the Beloved Disciple is not dealt with more fully, but here the weight of tradition carries the argument forward, as also in the interpretation of the two Johns of Papias. "The identity of the two Johns in the Papias list is still *sub judice*, but it is the only way out of the impasse." Many would be found to disagree with the thesis, at any rate as regards English critics, that they have been forced to prove the Gospel a "forgery" because of their rationalistic and anti-miraculous preconceptions.

E. C. C. HILL.

THE OLD TESTAMENT: ITS MAKING AND MEANING. By H. Wheeler Robinson. Hodder and Stoughton. 5s.

The professional student and the intelligent reader of the Bible are always glad to know of a book which will give them a bird's-eye view of the field of Old Testament criticism as it appears to an eminent scholar. Such a book Dr. Wheeler Robinson has given them in this first volume of the London Theological Library.

If they are curious to know what he thinks about Deuteronomy, they will find that it still stands where it did before Welch and Hölscher tried to persuade us to place it before and after 621 B.C. In Job, the Elihu speeches, the "meditation" on wisdom, and perhaps the second speech of Yahweh, are not part of the original poem, but the prologue and epilogue are essential to the author's ultimate purpose. The Psalter can be safely used as a source book for post-exilic, but not for pre-exilic, religion. Canticles is an anthology of love-songs, but it is neither dramatic nor connected with the Tammuz-Ishtar cult. In Hosea, chapter iii. is the sequel to chapter i., and chapter xiv. rests on the personal experience of chapter iii. The fact that Ezekiel was a priest as well as a prophet explains some of the distinctive features of his prophecy, and Dr. Robinson does not

feel that the time has yet come for doubting the substantial unity of the book. Nehemiah viii.-x. probably belongs to the "memoirs" of Ezra, and the date of Ezra's arrival in Jerusalem was in the seventh year of the second Artaxerxes, not the first. One could have wished that Dr. Robinson had had more space at his disposal in order that he might have "shewn the workings" by which his conclusions are reached, but you cannot have everything in a book of this size!

It should be added that by the "making" of the Old Testament the author implies the analytical study of literary origins, and by the "meaning" those qualities of the book which this study reveals the more clearly. "The story of the *making* of the Old Testament remains the essential guide to its proper interpretation, but the *meaning* grows with the experience of every interpreter who finds God in it and through it."

S. L. Brown.

The Spiritual Life. Four Broadcast Talks. By Evelyn Underhill. Hodder and Stoughton. 2s. 6d.

If Evelyn Underhill were to make a pile of all her books placed carefully one above another, and to stand beside it, I wonder whether she or the pile would be the taller.

Quite near the bottom, surely, would be three very charming and unusual novels, and some verse, and of course the standard work on Mysticism to which all writers on the subject refer, whether they read it or not. Could the authoress herself recall, without an effort, the names of all these children of her brain? And which out of the number should we select as the best?

The Spiritual Life may certainly be placed in the first class, and some examiners would star it. When Evelyn Underhill sat at the microphone, and sent her voice across space to thousands of unseen listeners, her heart must have been full of true apostolic zeal and love of souls. She was not there to display her knowledge of German metaphysics, or the extent of her acquaintance with mystics great and small. She was not there to impress anyone with her grasp of the psychological theories involved in spiritual exercises and systems of meditation. She was there to bring human beings into touch with their Creator, and, please God, she would do it, if she could.

So the talks were what they were meant to be, a breath of pure air from the Kingdom of Heaven, sweeping into the stuffy little houses that men and women delight to shut themselves up in. A great increase of spiritual health must have been the result—for we assume that windows were, on this occasion, at least ajar.

A few words of criticism may be forgiven.

Evelyn Underhill, commenting on "Hallowed be Thy Name," reminds us that adoration is the first duty we owe to God, and awe our most fitting attitude before Him. It was surely unnecessary, though, for her to contrast the petition with "the dreadful prattle of theology." "The dreadful prattle of theology" is a very foolish expression, and no wiser because Karl Barth apparently originated it. An intellectual such as Evelyn Underhill ought to know better than to repeat it. Even "the dreadful prattle of theologians" would have been unkind. And Tom, Dick and

Harry, at the other end of the wireless, do not need to be encouraged in disrespectful thoughts about their betters.

There is one inexplicable omission in the book. The reality of the spiritual world and the reasonableness of its claims on us are eloquently set forth. There is a brave quotation from St. Augustine, asserting that we are real only in so far as we live in God and He in us. Of course, in four short talks, Evelyn Underhill could not say everything, and she doubtless wished to avoid the substance of an ordinary sermon. I admit, too, that the books she recommends for further reading are Christian books. And yet where one looks for the one dominating Figure, who gives not only precision, but life, to all our apprehension of the spiritual world, there is little save a luminous blank.

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

GOD AND HIS WORKS and STUDIES IN ST. THOMAS. By A. G. Hebert, S.S.M. S.P.C.K. 4s. 6d. Each part separately, 2s. 6d.

Father Hebert published some time ago, in the valuable S.P.C.K. series of "Texts for Students," some selections from Part I. of the *Summa Theologica*. He now gives us the selected passages bound in one volume with his own explanatory comments, based on the lecture-notes compiled for his students at Kelham.

We have no hesitation in saying that this is a most valuable book, worth dozens of the ephemeral theological treatises that pour from the press. The busy priest, anxious to read, but with sadly restricted time, must seek the best for his studies. We strongly commend this volume. It is not easy, despite Father Hebert's modest claim to have produced no more than "an elementary study for the use of beginners." But the majestic strength of St. Thomas's thought about God, lightened by the keen and original mind of his commentator, is most satisfying to anyone who will settle down to work at the book. The great philosopher-saint deserves our patient study, but the formidable scale and extent of the *Summa* is deterrent to us who have to live in the scurrying business of the modern world. This selection, drawn from the Saint's massive argument on the nature of God, is just what we need, and the commentary gives precisely the help and guidance that is called for. This is a book to recur to again and again.

We must not fail to mention with peculiar satisfaction the fine reproduction of Botticelli's painting of St. Thomas which faces the title-page.

H. BALMFORTH.

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher